

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



127 771

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

THE IMPACT OF THE WAR UPON AMERICAN EDUCATION

THE IMPACT OF THE WAR UPON AMERICAN EDUCATION

By
I. L. KANDEL

CHAPEL HILL
THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA PRESS

1948

Copyright, 1948, by
THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA PRESS

Printed in the United States of America

The William Byrd Press, Inc.
Richmond, Virginia

The publication of this volume
was aided by a subsidy from the
AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES

PREFACE

THE accompanying book is one of a series of reports, planned by the Social Science Research Council, the American Council of Learned Societies, and the National Research Council, to record the impact of the war upon various phases of our national life. A general account of these plans was presented by Dr. Shepard B. Clough in an article on "Clio and Mars: The Study of World War II in America," *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. LX, No. 3, September 1945, pp. 425 ff. The present volume was prepared under the auspices of the Committee on War Studies of the American Council of Learned Societies. No attempt was made in this report to discuss the educational activities in the armed services or what might be learned from them, since this task was undertaken by the special commission under the chairmanship of Dr. Alonzo Grace, appointed by the American Council on Education. The author desires to express his indebtedness to the American Council of Learned Societies for the opportunity of recording the history of "The Impact of the War upon American Education" "while it was hot."

I. L. KANDEL

New York, 1947

CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. Introduction	3
II. Leadership in Time of Crisis	12
III. Educational Deficiencies Revealed by the War	41
Mental and Physical Deficiencies	41
The Care of Children	45
Child Labor	52
Juvenile Delinquency	55
Exodus of Teachers	61
Federal Aid for Education	66
IV. Secondary Education for All	77
Adjusting the High Schools to the War Effort	77
Exodus of High School Students	85
Acceleration	88
High School Victory Corps	90
New Emphases in the Curriculum	93
The Unrest in Secondary Education and Proposals for Reform	101
V. Higher Education	123
Students and Selective Service	123
Higher Educational Institutions in Counsel	128
Training Courses for Specific Activities	145
Acceleration	148
Army and Navy Specialized Training Programs	151
The Record of the War Years	156
Higher Education of Women and the War	165

VI. Liberal Education and the College Curriculum . . .	172
The Unrest in Higher Education.	172
The Search for Values and Liberal Education	188
College Teachers	193
The Cult of the Immediate	197
Planning Postwar College Education	200
New Interests and New Directions	231
VII. Education and the Armed Forces	240
Plans for the Education of Veterans	240
Accreditation and Prospective Enrollments	245
Post-hostilities Education Program	254
VIII. International Cultural Relations	260
IX. Lessons of the War	274
Index	279

■

THE IMPACT OF THE WAR
UPON AMERICAN EDUCATION

■

INTRODUCTION

EDUCATION is a social process which derives its meaning and purposes from the culture of a people whether organized as a community or as a nation. In the past, when wars were fought with professional or volunteer armies, the effects upon the normal life of a people or upon the progress of education were not felt either directly or immediately. Nevertheless some connection between education and victory in war began to be noted from the beginning of the nineteenth century. Thus the Battle of Waterloo was won on the playing fields of Eton and the Battle of Sedan by the Prussian schoolmaster. As wars have become global and all the resources of the nations engaged in them must be drawn upon, it is inevitable that the normal life of all, whether in the combat services or far from the fighting fronts, should be completely disrupted. Under such conditions the normal progress of education is seriously affected. The call of patriotism, the demand for man power, the urge to service of any kind that may contribute to victory produce first uncertainty and unrest before measures are devised to adapt the national organization to the national crisis. Aggressor nations enter into war with all their plans ready made; there is a place for everybody and everybody is in his assigned place.

In a country like the United States, which was relatively unprepared and which hoped until the last minute not to be drawn into war, plans had to be improvised and adjustments had to be made as and when the occasion arose. This was true even though Hitler's early successes stimulated a movement to promote "Education for Defense." That movement, however, was directed not so much to preparation for war as to arousing the nation to the dangers that threatened the preservation of the democratic ideals of the American people. It took some time after Pearl Harbor before plans were drafted for the continuance of the machinery of education or its adjustments to the new needs produced by the crisis. If any lessons had been learned from

World War I, they had either been forgotten or were regarded as inadequate for a war which demanded new weapons and new methods. Even after the enactment of Selective Service, which was to affect institutions of higher education directly, no steps were taken to relieve them of the uncertainty about their immediate future. There was never any doubt about the readiness of all concerned with higher education to place all their resources and all their efforts at the disposal of the government as they had done in World War I. For some time, however, neither the institutions themselves nor the students of selective service age were given the lead for which they were waiting.

The impact of World War II on education was more general and widespread than during World War I. It affected not only institutions of higher education, including institutions for the preparation of teachers, but also primary education to some degree and secondary education to a great degree. Because of the large numbers of mothers who entered war industries, provision had to be made for the care of their children. Because of the disruption of home life, a result of this as well as other causes, the care of children in general and the increase in juvenile delinquency gave rise to another set of problems. Finally, a serious and growing crisis was caused by the withdrawal of teachers from schools for war service or for war industries.

The war imposed new demands upon educational institutions. The normal programs of secondary schools had to give way to a large extent, if not wholly, to programs of "Education for Victory" and to vocational preparation. Colleges and universities to the degree that they were capable were called upon to devote their resources and efforts to the preparation of their students not only for service in the armed forces but for technical services in war industries and other occupations created to meet war needs. Both secondary schools and institutions of higher education found themselves threatened with the disappearance of the traditional academic studies, except those which appeared to be needed for winning the war.

The impact of a great national crisis, is, however, more far-reaching than the immediate effects that it has on its social and cultural institutions. A crisis like World War II challenges every aspect of a nation's political, economic, social, and cultural or-

ganization. It throws a flood of light on the strong and weak points of that organization. In the United States that evaluation or self-survey had already begun before the country actually entered into the war. The process of self-examination had already been started during the years of the depression, it was further stimulated by the challenge of totalitarian ideologies to the ideals of democracy. World War II served as the culminating test in a process which had already been begun. The nation's system of education, no less than other social institutions, was subjected to searching inquiry. The issue was not only whether the system could meet the test of war, but whether it was adequate to meet the demands of the peace that would follow the war.

American education has never suffered from a lack of criticism. Since the opening of the twentieth century the system has been in a constant state of readjustment and readaptation. The only aspect that has been stable has been the faith of the public in education. The war revealed anew the ability of the American people to meet a great crisis, an ability fostered by its cultural tradition in general and by its educational aims in particular. But the war also focussed attention on certain deficiencies in the educational system, which, though known vaguely in times of peace, were given such publicity that they could no longer be ignored.

A public which had always prided itself on its educational system and on the amount of money spent on it was informed that large numbers of young men had to be rejected by the Selective Service either because of illiteracy or because of physical deficiencies. While there was at no time any fear about the morale or the patriotism of the American people, there were some who expressed alarm lest a somewhat easy-going educational theory which had been dominant for two decades might have made the problem of discipline difficult. The word discipline, which had virtually disappeared from the literature of education except to be derided, was again seriously discussed. Despite the constantly increasing enrollments in high schools and colleges since World War I, when the hour of trial came, it was found that the supply of personnel adequately prepared in mathematics, sciences, and the foreign languages which these institutions professed to teach was inadequate. Although federal funds

had been available for vocational education since 1917, the number of workers with the skills needed both in the armed services and in war industries was not large enough to meet the demands. For this situation, however, the responsibility could not wholly be placed upon the schools, first because the skills needed for the conduct of the war were so varied and numerous that they could not have been anticipated, and secondly because many who had been trained had not used their skills owing to unemployment during the depression.

One of the most serious effects of the war was uncertainty as to the direction to be followed by educational institutions. It was not clear whether the high schools should prepare youth directly for some form of war service or whether they should bend their efforts to maintaining the academic tradition as far and as long as possible. The issue was solved for the education authorities by the students themselves who were only too ready to leave school for industry with or without the necessary preparation and despite Go-To-School Drives. Institutions of higher education ceased to be their own masters and were virtually compelled, if they were to exist at all, to provide the preparation demanded for the armed services and for the technical fields. In both cases the academic subjects suffered, and while leaders of thought on secondary education seemed to be ready to allow them to disappear, those concerned with higher education felt it to be their obligation to do all that could be done to preserve a place for the humanities; the sciences, pure and applied, needed no special pleading.

Colleges and universities at any rate recognized their dual obligation—first, to contribute to winning the war, and second, to prevent a “blackout” of liberal education if the future of American culture was to be protected. The contribution to winning the war these institutions were called upon to make and were able to make; how to preserve liberal education and promote the study of the humanities was recognized to be a major problem of the postwar reconstruction of higher education.

The pooling of the resources of the nation for the war effort directed attention to one aspect of the educational system which had been taken too much on faith—the extent to which the

ideal equality of educational opportunity had been translated into practice. The question was not new; it had been raised at the time of the national crisis caused by World War I. It was recognized then that the provision of equal educational opportunity was still an ideal which was far from being achieved. This realization led to proposals for federal aid for education in order to reduce the existing inequalities. Since that time numerous committees have reported strongly in favor of federal aid. World War II brought the country to a clearer realization that education is a national concern and that, if the faith of the American people in education and in the ideal of giving every potential citizen a chance for his fullest development is to continue, the resources of the nation must be pooled. Unlike other countries which were faced with the task of replacing their dual systems of education—one for the masses and the other for the select minority—by a broad highway, the United States had built up an educational organization which leads from the kindergarten to the university. The task in the United States is two-fold—to remove the inequalities resulting from the maldistribution of taxable wealth and of population, and to improve the quality of education.

During the war the realization of the existing inequalities was sharpened by the reports of the Selective Service on the number of young men who had to be rejected on account of mental and physical deficiencies. The figures on illiteracy only helped to confirm the reports of the census of 1940 on the subject. Shortages were discovered in many areas of study which high schools and colleges professed to teach. Finally, the large numbers of teachers who, whether for patriotic or other reasons, left the profession to enter the war industries, directed attention to the fact that salaries paid to teachers were not commensurate with the great ideal of education for American democracy which had so long been professed by the American public. Schools were closed or were conducted for short terms; many subjects included in the high school curriculum had to be abandoned for lack of adequately prepared teachers; the enrollments in institutions for the preparation of teachers fell off sharply, and short courses leading to emergency certificates began to be offered throughout the country to the detriment of acceptable standards

of teacher qualifications. All these facts, combined with increased amount of funds provided by the federal government to maintain the fabric of education during the depression years and to meet the needs of trained personnel for the armed forces and for war industries, although in both instances emergency measures, helped to bring the proposals for federal aid for education nearer to realization than ever before. Fear of federal control of education was abated as a result of the methods adopted for the distribution of federal funds to meet emergency conditions.

Education began to be recognized as a national concern if the ideal equality of opportunity was to be implemented effectively. The war and the years immediately preceding it introduced another note into American education—the realization that the United States cannot exist in an internationally interdependent world without disseminating knowledge and understanding of the cultures of other peoples and without adequate preparation of men and women to assume leadership in the conduct of international affairs whether political or economic. National interest alone would in any case have pointed in this direction. More than national interest, however, was the recognition that the peace of the world depends upon the development of international understanding and cooperation. While it is possible to exaggerate the influence of the experience of service by members of the armed forces in different parts of the world, there can be no doubt that this experience can in some measure be relied upon to support the advancement of international studies in American education.

Leadership in this movement was assumed by a number of agencies of government and was an expansion of the Good Neighbor Policy sponsored by President Roosevelt. The creation in the Department of State of the Division of Cultural Relations, intended to promote cultural cooperation with all parts of the world but limited by the outbreak of war to the Latin American Republics, marked a new trend in American politics. This trend was further indicated by the establishment of the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs and by the expanded activities of the U. S. Office of Education in the field of international educational relations. Further expansion of activities in this area was promised as the war drew to a victorious end, and

the promise was fulfilled when the United States accepted membership in the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, in the creation of which American educators played an outstanding part.

Governmental activities in the field of international cultural relations, however, supplemented and in many ways strengthened the activities already developed by private, voluntary agencies and local school systems. One of the striking movements in American education in the years immediately preceding and during the war was the widespread introduction in educational institutions at all levels of courses on the cultures of other peoples. Beginning first with courses on Latin America, the movement expanded to include other areas of the world. To this movement may be added the interest aroused in the study of those foreign languages which had not in the past been included in the curricula of high schools, colleges, and universities. This interest was stimulated by the reports on the intensified methods of language instruction given to selected personnel of the armed forces. Although the reports of the success of these methods were too frequently misinterpreted by both the public and professional educators, it was thought that the methods could be revised for general use in normal programs of instruction. More important perhaps than the contribution of the army and navy methods to language instruction was the emphasis placed upon the fact that language is not only a means of communication but a tool by means of which knowledge and understanding of the culture of the people who use it can be acquired.

In the general evaluation which was stimulated by the crisis of the war, attention was directed to one defect in American education—the lack of a sense of direction in schools and institutions of higher education. American education since the beginning of the twentieth century has been experimental, a quality of undeniable value, but one which can only be afforded if the experiments are directed to some attainable goal. That goal appears to have been lacking. The criticism of education which was general during the war years was that inadequate attention had been paid to the spiritual values which give the ideal of democracy its meaning. To correct this defect some advocated more attention to religious instruction; others, and particularly those concerned

with the reconstruction of the college curriculum, stressed the importance of the preservation of the humanities and the values for which they stand. In an age when the contributions of science and technology have impressed themselves upon the minds of the public, it is felt that a proper balance must be maintained between the values inherent in the sciences and the values that can be found in the humanities.

Even before the outbreak of the war the challenge of totalitarian ideologies to the ideals of democracy had already caused some concern about the effectiveness of American education at all levels in inculcating the meaning and values of that ideal. Democracy, it was felt, was taken too much for granted. It was for these reasons that President Roosevelt stressed the importance of instruction in the ideal of democracy. At the celebration of the tercentenary anniversary of Harvard University the President took occasion to say, "Love of liberty and freedom of thought is a most admirable attribute of Harvard. But it is not an exclusive possession of Harvard or of any other university in America. In the name of the American nation I venture to ask you to cherish its traditions and to fulfill its highest opportunities." And at the Congress on Education on Democracy, held at Teachers College, Columbia University, in August, 1939, President Roosevelt stated in his message that "Education for democracy cannot merely be taken for granted. . . . That the schools make worthy citizens is the most important responsibility placed upon them." The assessment of American education which was made during the war years only helped to confirm the importance of devoting greater attention than ever before to inculcating the meaning and values of the ideal of democracy which the nation was called upon to protect and preserve.

Every aspect of American education was subjected to scrutiny. The tempo of critical discussion did not slacken during the war years. Suggestions for the reconstruction of education poured forth in a body of literature larger even than in a corresponding number of peace years. How soon the fruits of these discussions and suggestions will appear depends on a large number of forces. One point is clear—the blueprint for the next advances in American education has been drafted. Whether all the details of that blueprint will prove acceptable or even practicable is not so clear.

Whatever the development in the years ahead may be, it will be within the framework of the General Purpose defined in a pamphlet issued in 1944 by the National Education Association, *Proposals for Public Education in Post-war America, A Suggested Basis for Planning at the Local, State, and Federal Levels*:

To provide for every child, youth and adult attending a public school, college, or university the kind and amount of education which (a) will cause him to live most happily and usefully according to the principles of American democracy, and (b) lead him to contribute all he can to the development and preservation of a peaceful, cooperative, and equitable world order.

LEADERSHIP IN TIME OF CRISIS

ALTHOUGH the United States did not enter the war until December, 1941, the threat of impending war in Europe exercised a strong influence on the trend of educational thought for several years before its actual outbreak. There was a widespread realization that what was taking place in Europe was a direct challenge to the ideals and institutions of democracy. While there was no expectation that the United States would not be drawn into a war, it was recognized that the supreme task of education was to direct its attention to disseminating a fuller concept and a richer appreciation of the meaning of democracy. Nothing better illustrates the strength of democratic institutions than the fact that voluntary organizations, without waiting for direction from governmental authorities, can assume leadership in times of crisis. That leadership was assumed by the Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association for Elementary and Secondary Education, by the American Council on Education for higher education, and by the United States Office of Education. All organizations addressed themselves to the task of promoting education for national defense, which before the country was drawn into the war meant education to strengthen the foundations of democracy and after Pearl Harbor meant the utilization of the country's educational resources to promote the war effort.

The Educational Policies Commission¹ directed its attention to the problems of education for democracy as one of its major activities a few years before the war began in Europe. In a series of reports and pamphlets the Commission made outstanding contributions for the enlightenment of all concerned with the meaning of education in a democracy. Although these publications were addressed to the American scene, it was clear that they were inspired by the challenge of ideologies which threatened

1. The leadership of the American Council on Education is discussed in Chapter V.

the existence of democracy. The five reports—*The Unique Function of Education in American Democracy* (1937); *The Structure and Administration of Education in American Democracy* (1938); *The Purposes of Education in American Democracy* (1938); *Education and Economic Well-Being in American Democracy* (1940); and *The Education of Free Men in American Democracy* (1941)—together constitute a survey of the meaning of democracy and a blueprint for that education which is designed to preserve and perpetuate it. They served at once as an answer to the challenge of totalitarian ideologies and as a much-needed expression of what was to be defended.

The defense of democratic ideals and institutions was, indeed, the major preoccupation of American educators as the clouds of impending war began to overshadow Europe. In August, 1939, a Congress on Education for Democracy was held in New York under the auspices of Teachers College, Columbia University. The Congress was attended by representatives from the leading American national organizations, lay and professional, and from the democratic nations of Europe. The following topics were discussed at the congress: "Democracy and Its Challenge," "Democracy in Other Lands," "The Contribution of Religion to Education for Democracy," "Present Educational Opportunities for Rural Youth in a Democracy," "The Contribution of Higher Education and Adult Education in a Democracy," "Democracy at Work," "Democracy Moves Forward," and "Looking Forward."

The keynote of the congress was sounded in a letter to Dean William F. Russell from President Franklin D. Roosevelt in which the President wrote:

Everyone knows that democracy can not long stand unless its foundation is kept constantly reinforced through the process of education. What is not so universally understood is that colleges and universities have a responsibility to imbue prospective teachers with a clear appreciation of the part they must play in this process.

Education for democracy can not merely be taken for granted. What goes on in the schools every hour of the day, on the playground and in the classroom, whether reflecting methods of control by the teacher, or opportunities for self-expression by the pupils, must be checked against the fact that the children are growing up to

live in a democracy. That the schools make worthy citizens is the most important responsibility placed upon them.

May I congratulate you and express the hope that as a result of the Congress on Education for Democracy, a great wave of interest will spread over the land out of which will grow more and more effective methods of bringing to pass our cherished ideal of democracy.²

The congress had hardly come to a close when Hitler's armies were already on the march and the defense of democracy passed the stage of discussion and became a reality. The United States sought to preserve neutrality, but intellectual neutrality could not be maintained. On September 8, 1939, the President of the United States declared that a limited "national emergency exists." In October, 1939, the Educational Policies Commission issued a pamphlet on *American Education and the War in Europe*, prefaced by the following statement on "Education for a Day of Peace":

Those who are commissioned by society in the service of education should be the last to capitulate to the forces of hatred, greed, and fear. With the darkness of war falling upon half the world, the United States becomes more than ever a reservoir of hope for a humane and democratic order among men. When peace comes again, as come it must, the people of the United States ought to be prepared to play their part—sanely, bravely, and generously, in the process of rebuilding a world order from which the threat of war and violence may be removed. Those who are to fulfill that mission can approach the task best if their hands are unstained by blood, their spirits uncorroded by hatred, and their minds uncrippled by months or years of wartime regimentation (p. ii).

Much was to happen before this high expression of hope could be fulfilled. For the time, however, the position of the American people was defined as follows:

All elements of the American public, including the teaching profession, are seeking eagerly for means whereby the interests of the American people and of humanity may be safeguarded in the period of strain through which the world is passing.

The policies recommended here rest upon the fact that the

2. For a report of the proceedings of the Congress see *Education for Democracy*, New York, 1939.

United States is at present a neutral nation. It is the conviction of the Commission that under present conditions the American people will make their greatest contribution to the protection and survival of democratic values by refraining from military participation in Europe (p. iv).

The nation politically was neutral and was expected to remain neutral, but the study and discussion of problems relating to the war was a responsibility of education that could not be escaped. The Commission offered the following suggestions on this issue:

Probably no events in the past quarter-century have so profoundly stirred the American people as those concerned with the present European war. Youths and adults are eager to share in appraising the significance of those happenings, anticipating their outcomes, and developing a policy for the American people with reference to them.

In such circumstances there are several courses of action open to those in charge of the educational program. One possibility is to forbid discussion of such issues in the school and in other activities under the control of the teacher. Another possibility is to give free rein to the discussion of this question with neither guidance nor stimulation on the part of the teacher.

An adequate sense of responsibility will not approve of either of these extremes. Neither repression of discussion nor abdication of responsibility is an appropriate policy for American education. At such a time as this, the schools should serve as centers of community deliberation with reference to the pending issues. They should not evade any question which is pertinent to a better understanding of the international situation and of America's relation to it. The education of a free people should know no undebatable propositions. Confusion, ignorance, and indifference are not the same as impartiality (p. 1).

American educators should, by word and deed, give assurance to their colleagues in all countries of the world, belligerent as well as neutral, that whatever dark days may lie ahead for humanity as a result of the international conflict, they will do their part in keeping the torch of culture and civilization alight (p. 11).

The changes in the war situation were reflected by the publications of the Commission, which in turn reflected the attitude of the American public. As the "phony" war ended and country

after country fell before the onslaught of the Nazi hordes, it began to be realized that more was needed for national defense than the study and discussion of problems relating to the war. It was clearly recognized that the destinies of this country were involved. In *Education and the Defense of American Democracy* (July, 1940) the Commission directed the attention of educators to the danger which threatened the world dominated by military might and becoming hostile to the ideal of a common humanity. This danger was all the greater as Britain was fighting in the last ditch. Recognizing this, the Commission stated:

If the British Empire should be destroyed and the United Kingdom shorn of its power or reduced to a condition of vassalage, the outlook will be yet more critical. Unprotected by the British fleet and without many of the powerful friends of the past, America must assume vastly increased responsibility for the defense of democracy and human freedom. The present generation must rise to the intellectual and moral stature of the men and women who founded the Republic. The age demands nothing less of them.

The situation calls for a bold and comprehensive program for the defense of American democracy. This program must assume three aspects—military, economic, and moral.

Without the loss of a single day the American people should move to achieve the greatest possible military strength in the shortest possible time (pp. 4 f.)

To the development of this program the contribution of the education system was defined as follows:

The Educational Policies Commission knows that in the defense of American democracy our system of education must play a central role. A true product of that democracy, from the kindergarten to the university and from the smallest rural district to the United States Office of Education, it stands ready to throw its resources into the balance. It can share in laying the physical and mental groundwork for effective military service. It can take a large part in providing the vocational and technical training which the conduct of modern war requires. It can help to achieve a national unity by clarifying national goals and by inculcating loyalties to the values basic to a society of free men. It can assist in releasing and organizing productive energies. It can aid adult citizens to reach sound conclusions on the urgent questions of national policy (p. 7).

The school system could contribute to military preparation by fostering intellectual development through general education, by providing health and physical education with periodic health examinations, by emphasizing training in basic military skills, and by inculcating abiding loyalties to American ideals. The promotion of moral defense would require education to foster understanding of the nature and goals of democracy, to inculcate deep loyalties and devotion to building a better America, and to maintain conditions conducive to national unity. Every resource of education should be used for the defense of democracy. The call of the hour was for unity of aims and cooperative action.

A month before Pearl Harbor, in November, 1941, the Commission issued a pamphlet on *Education and the Morale of a Free People*. Morale was defined as "a state of mind characterized by confidence and courage, a well-founded confidence in the value of one's ideals, a steel-cold courage which, over the long pull, makes victory for those ideals certain" (p. 3). The elements of morale included health, economic security, psychological security, confidence in associates, and loyalty to a common purpose. The Commission accordingly recommended that the work of the schools and colleges should be strengthened in health, safety, and physical education, that inequalities in educational opportunities should be lessened and sympathetic understanding of economic questions should be developed, that feelings of confidence and self-assurance should be created in the young, that attention should be devoted at all levels of education to the development, appreciation, and application of ethical standards and moral values, and that public understanding of the responsibility of the citizenry for good government should be strengthened and the values of democracy taught with honesty and enthusiasm. The pamphlet concluded with the statement that

The basic means for the development of morale in the United States, the only means that gives promise of success, the only means that is worthy of a free people, is the means of education. A morale thus created will not only withstand the totalitarian threat today but it will also endure to broaden and strengthen the growth of our democracy in the long pull ahead (p. 28).

In February, 1942, two months after Pearl Harbor, the Commission attacked the problems which confronted the educational

system in a pamphlet, *A War Policy for American Schools*, which opened with the following statement:

When the schools closed on Friday, December 5, they had many purposes and they followed many roads to achieve those purposes. When the schools opened on Monday, December 8, they had one dominant purpose—complete, intelligent, and enthusiastic cooperation in the war effort. The very existence of free schools anywhere in the world depends upon the achievement of that purpose.

It is already clear that many educational adaptations are required. Many aspects of education will need to be strengthened and extended. Other aspects, very important ones in time of peace, may be redirected or otherwise modified in order that the total expanded efforts of wartime education may be applied at the points of greatest need (p. 3).

A choice must accordingly be made between the school activities of those that were of the first importance and to establish priorities among them. A guide to the selection of the educational priorities was presented in the following statement:

The responsibilities of organized education for the successful outcome of the war involve at least the following eleven groups of activities. Each of these services should be given serious consideration by all school boards and educational workers. Without abandoning essential services of the schools, appropriate war duties of the schools should be given absolute and immediate priority in time, attention, personnel, and funds over any and all other activities.

Training workers for war industries and services

Producing goods and services needed for the war

Conserving materials by prudent consumption and salvage

Helping to raise funds to finance the war

Increasing effective man power by correcting effective deficiencies

Promoting health and physical efficiency

Protecting children and property against attack

Protecting the ideals of democracy against war hazards

Teaching the issues, aims, and progress of the war and the peace

Sustaining the morale of children and adults

Maintaining intelligent loyalty to American democracy (pp. 4 f.)

In addition to these priorities which were not listed in the order of their *relative* importance, the Commission directed attention

to the importance of adult education as a central responsibility, to the need of maintaining the supply of competent teachers, and to the desirability of articulating education with Selective Service and war industries through counseling youth with reference to employment in the war industries, to volunteering in the armed forces, and to continuing their education. To achieve unity and direction of purpose without governmental compulsion the Commission urged, on the one hand, cooperation between all public and private agencies and clear assignment of functions among them in order to avoid duplication or conflicting efforts, and, on the other, leadership by a single strong agency in the federal government to furnish "reliable information and guidance, especially in those educational fields to which the schools are least accustomed." The agency recommended by the Commission was the United States Office of Education. To meet educational needs that would be national in scope and beyond the powers of the states to meet unaided, federal financial support would be required. So far as the schools were concerned, students and teachers should be encouraged to participate "in the formation of local programs and policies on matters in which they are, or may learn to be, competent." The pamphlet concluded with a call to the teaching profession, for

Never was there a time when the profession of education carried such a heavy responsibility, never a time when its members might feel a greater pride in the significance of their work, never a better opportunity to serve the nation. Let our profession but answer boldly the call of the crisis and we shall fashion, even out of the harsh necessities of war, a school system more fit for the education of free men (p. 42).

In a foreword to the pamphlet, *The Support of Education in Wartime*, issued by the Commission in September, 1942, President Roosevelt paid a tribute to the work already undertaken by the teachers of this country: "Teachers as a group are performing a great service to their country. Children must not be allowed to pay the cost of this war in neglect or serious loss of educational opportunity. I know the teachers will find deep satisfaction in the contribution they are making" (p. 1).

The shortage of teachers, which was to prove to be the most serious consequence of the war, was already beginning to be

noted. The pamphlet, addressed to teachers, parents and taxpayers, stressed the contributions which education was making and could continue to make in helping to win the war. It was providing a steady flow of skilled workers into the war industries; it released and directed the energies of nearly thirty million children and young people to contribute to the war effort through various forms of personal service, summer and odd-job work, salvage campaigns, collection of funds, building morale, and sharing in recreational community services. Education supported medical and other services necessary for physical fitness and could develop "the knowledge, loyalty, discipline which will maintain our ideals against the hazards of war and reconstruction." Education, it was urged, was "one of the essentials, both for its war-time value and for its long-run economic and social results." In its call to the teachers of the country the Commission stated that "*Now is the time* to adapt, expand, and improve the educational services to our embattled nation"; in its appeal to parents the Commission made the point that "*Now is the time*, the only possible time, to provide good education for your children." In its statement to the taxpayers the Commission emphasized the importance of maintaining and strengthening the schools for the following reasons:

Your schools must be kept going during the war. Will they be maintained on a penny-wise basis or stepped up in efficiency so that they may increase their contributions to victory? Reductions in the school budget would not materially reduce your tax burden; they could, however, impair the morale and efficiency of the whole educational service.

Education, health, and cultural services use little or no goods that are critically needed in war production. Keep your sense of pride in the opportunities your committee offers to young people. *Now is the time* to spend money for the services that will make American youth skilful and strong enough to win the war and wise enough to build a lasting peace.

What the Schools Should Teach in Wartime was the theme of the pamphlet issued by the Commission in January, 1943. At the elementary level schools were urged, in addition to developing skills and habits of accuracy in the usual subjects, to "maintain the greatest possible amount of security, courage and self-

confidence," to promote good health, to "provide many opportunities for community service, both of a wartime and peacetime nature," to "expand and improve the teaching of cultural and physical geography," to "emphasize the ideals of freedom and equality for which we are fighting," and to "enrich the artistic, literary, and musical experience of the children and the community." At the secondary school level the work would inevitably be affected by the war conditions since "every young person must be regarded as a reservist in preparation for the armed forces and for the war industries." The Commission emphasized the importance of occupational guidance and counseling, of preinduction training to meet the needs of the armed forces, and occupational training to meet the growing demands for man power in war industries. For the usual academic subjects—mathematics, science, and languages—the Commission, in view of the fact that the nation in wartime did not need a large number of specialists, recommended the selection of students who by tests or other methods showed aptitude in these subjects. Special attention should be given to health services and health and physical education, to home economics "adjusted to take cognizance of the many special responsibilities placed upon homemaking by the war," and to the arts—music, art, and literature—to promote morale and unity. The schools should provide opportunities during the summer vacations for pupils to engage in community service, industrial or farm work whenever an emergency requiring their services arose, and such work and work experience should be regarded as an integral part of the educational program. A serious responsibility was imposed upon the schools by the war conditions to devote attention to character education and to education for citizenship. Although the Commission recognized "fully that the problems of the peace are not unrelated to those of the war," the schools tended to pay more attention to the latter than the former. By following the Commission's suggestion that "long-range values, for them [the great majority of students], must be subordinated to the life-and-death needs of today and tomorrow," may indirectly have helped to swell the numbers who left school for wage-earning occupations without completing their courses. Go-To-School and Back-To-School Drives came too late to save the situation. At no time did long-range

values deserve more special consideration than during the war years.³

The Educational Policies Commission performed an invaluable service through its publications in the years immediately preceding the entrance of the United States into the war and during the war years.

The suggestion made by the Commission in its pamphlet, *A War Policy for American Schools*, that leadership should be assumed by a strong agency in the federal government had already been anticipated soon after Pearl Harbor, when Paul V. McNutt, Federal Security Administrator, in a letter to Dr. John W. Studebaker, United States Commissioner of Education, urged him to "Effect such an organization in connection with his office as will make possible the most direct and workable contacts both with government agencies on the one hand and educational institutions and organizations on the other."

The purpose of the proposed organization was defined as follows:

The object is (1) to facilitate the adjustment of educational agencies to war needs, and (2) to inform the government agencies directly responsible for the war effort concerning the services schools and colleges can render, and (3) to determine the possible effects upon schools and colleges of proposed policies and programs of these government agencies.

Following this letter the U. S. Office of Education Wartime Commission was established, consisting of fifty-eight members who represented educational associations with headquarters in Washington. Under the chairmanship of Dr. Studebaker the committee was organized into two divisions, one whose primary interest was in state and local administration, and the other whose primary interest was in higher education. The chairman of the first committee was Willard E. Givens, executive secretary of the National Education Association, and the chairman of the second was George F. Zook, president of the American Council on Education, both of whom were co-chairmen of another coordi-

3. The report of the Educational Policies Commission on *Education for All American Youth* was, in fact, a rationalization of wartime educational experience plus the accumulation of theories of secondary education which began to be discussed during the depression years. See pp. 109 ff.

nating agency, the National Committee on Education and Defense.⁴

The first meeting of the Wartime Commission, which was organized in such a way as to make frequent meetings possible, was held in Washington on December 23, 1941. The Commissioner of Education presented a list of problems concerning higher education, elementary and secondary schools, and education at all levels, which served as illustrations of the issues which the Commission would be called upon to deliberate. In a letter of December 26, 1941, to Dr. Studebaker, the Federal Security Administrator stated that his principal anxiety was "that schools and colleges may not move as rapidly as they should to render the most effective service to the nation in the immediate future." The Wartime Commission was requested to submit proposals and recommendations as promptly as possible on the problems: (1) The supply of trained personnel in engineering, physics, chemistry, and production management in order to provide adequate supervision of production programs. This would involve some program of acceleration in colleges and universities and possibly in high schools. (2) The need of making adjustments so that children would "not suffer unduly when mothers or other caretakers are called into occupations essential to winning the war." Here the task would be to provide care and education for young children, the necessary supervision for older children after school hours, and cooperation in other ways with the homes while mothers were at work in industry. The second problem involved what was to become the crucial educational issue during and after the war—the maintenance of an adequate supply of teachers. Of equal importance was the problem of developing "improved plans for an intelligent understanding of the war purposes and program," in order to implement and strengthen the work of the School and College Civilian Morale Service which had already been inaugurated several months before Pearl Harbor. To these problems the Wartime Commission devoted its attention through its two division committees and sections in each committee.⁵

4. See pages 128 ff.

5. See the report of Fred J. Kelly on "The Office of Education Wartime Commission," in *Higher Education and the War*, pp. 72 ff. American Council on Education Studies, Washington, D. C., 1942.

On March 3, 1942, the United States Office of Education began the publication of *Education for Victory*, an official bi-weekly, replacing *School Life* for the duration of the war. The publication was to serve as a valuable record both of the problems and of the purposes of education during the war years. In an introductory statement, which was to serve as the keynote of education during the war, Paul V. McNutt wrote as follows:

Education has been ever in the Nation's service. But in these days of total war that service has a new significance. "You're in the Army now" is no cliché—it is an expression of national necessity.

The schools have mobilized, magnificently. Defense training projects have helped man American industry. Reorganization of curriculum and the time table of the school year have enabled us to add speed and precision to the work of education. The schools and colleges have cooperated in the administration of the rationing and selective service registration programs. The Office of Education Wartime Commission has been set up to serve as a clearing house on all matters relating to educational facilities and programs.

To keynote this service, it is only fitting that the official publication of the United States Office of Education should be converted to a war basis to match the essential conversion of the educational program.⁶

To this statement the Commissioner of Education added the following:

As the U. S. Office of Education turns its full effort toward sacrifice, toward every new demand, toward every bit of teamwork to help win this war, it also faces squarely the continuing and grave responsibility of doing its utmost to speed sound educational programs for time to come. Both war and peace must be won. Victory must be so complete *this time* that peace will abide and endure throughout the world.

Successful victories by the allied nations in war front battles are vital to any constructive future. Adequate planning for the post-war period is vital to any constructive future. The education and training today, this year, next year, of all children and youth for effective democracy and for useful and needed work are vital to any constructive future. These children and youth must be qualified to carry on and forward the peace we seek through victory.⁷

6. *Education for Victory*, March 3, 1942, p. 1.

7. *Ibid.*

To meet the increasingly heavy responsibilities which the government would place upon organized education and to effect a closer relationship between the government and education the Wartime Commission was appointed. At its first meeting the Commission undertook to work on the following problems: (1) Training teachers for noncurricular activities, such as civilian air protection. (2) Volunteer, out-of-school services by school children. (3) Adaptations to be suggested for the curricula of elementary and secondary schools. (4) Advancement of vocational training, including training for war industries. (5) An attack on shortages of teachers and community service workers in adult education, nursery schools, etc., on adjustment and placement services for teachers, on acceleration of teacher-training, and on refresher courses for teachers and community-program workers. (6) Promotion of physical fitness among college and university students. And (7) problems of women students and the war, including services that women can render.

The Commission received new proposals and problems almost daily. Among these were the following: (1) The supply of county agents, 4-H club leaders, home demonstration agents, and other leaders of rural life. (2) Articulation of academic calendars of secondary schools and colleges to facilitate acceleration. (3) Applicability of the cooperative plan of study to the various types of colleges and universities. (4) Conservation of adequate personnel on all levels of education to provide a continuous supply of trained men and women. (5) Latest military developments and their implications for higher education. (6) Policies to be established regarding education and training of returned soldiers. (7) The best kind of military training for high school students.⁸

At its meeting on January 28, 1942, the Commission adopted a set of "principles relating wartime objectives to permanent objectives in education," all of which served as a guide for the conduct of education during the war years, but the first of which was to receive the greatest attention. The first principle in the list adopted was stated as follows: "War service comes first. In every instance where it can be shown that the successful prosecution of the war will be advanced by adjustments in educational

8. *Ibid.*, pp. 5 f.

purposes or organization, these changes should be made by the responsible educational authorities promptly and cheerfully."

In carrying out this principle the Commission pointed out that many of the peacetime objectives of education, such as preparation to do useful work, were equally applicable in time of war, that war service required certain new emphases, and that some time should be devoted "to that part of the war effort which is concerned with solid and enduring peace and reconstruction." The Commission endorsed the program proposed by the Educational Policies Commission in its pamphlet on *A War Policy for American Schools*.⁹

At its meeting on March 25, 1942, the Wartime Commission "went on record as recommending the fullest possible use of school and college personnel, plan, and equipment during the summer months as a part of education's all-out contribution toward winning the war." On the question of "The Best Kind of High School Training for Military Service" the Commission approved a report, the essence of which was stated in the following recommendation which was approved by the Commission and the designated officers in charge of training in the United States Army and the United States Navy:

Without prejudice to courses in military training already in existence, it may be stated that no one should be disappointed over lack of opportunity to take military drill before he enters the Army or the Navy. The armed services are equipped to give him the necessary drill in a short time after he enlists or is inducted.

For some of his training in other respects, equally important to his military efficiency, the Army and Navy prefer to rely upon the schools. Because of deficiencies of many of those that come to them, the armed services, however, are constantly compelled to instruct recruits in areas and subjects in which the schools are entirely competent to supply the training. In the pages which follow an effort is made to indicate in broad outline the contribution which schools can make to preinduction training. *The courses proposed are not a substitute for military training; they are military training in as real a sense as in military drill.*

The Army and Navy need competent, alert, loyal, brave, and healthy men who are able both to give orders and to obey them. No amount of technical or military skill can be considered a sub-

9. *Ibid.*, p. 6.

stitute for these essential qualities. They are produced through study and discipline, contact and association, competitive games and sports, and observance of the laws of health. The best agency available to American democracy for developing these characteristics in all youth has been and continues to be the schools, public and private.

Schools should accordingly emphasize health and physical fitness, and training in skills and information needed: good health, physical fitness, endurance, safety from war hazards; fundamental information and patriotic motives through basic subjects such as mathematics, science, English, and social studies; and specialized knowledge and vocational skill.¹⁰

In a report on "Activities of School Children Related to the War Effort," approved at this meeting, it was recommended that the school program, curricular and extracurricular, should be looked upon as a whole with close and active cooperation between the schools and all other local agencies, public and private. The general principle to be followed was stated thus: "In all activities, emphasis should be placed on the conservation of all resources, human and material, and on the efficient utilization of these resources at all times in the productive war effort." Such activities would include conservation of material and human resources and voluntary contributions to the war effort in money or materials or in services. Preparation should be given for later services in employment in war industries, for summer employment, and in superior workmanship. Emphasis should be placed upon the care and improvement of health through the development and preservation of health habits that would insure physical stamina to perform extra tasks in an emergency and by correcting physical defects as quickly as possible after they were discovered. And, finally, the schools should develop a sense of the responsibilities in a democracy at war by giving an understanding of the background, status, and problems of the war and of the privileges and responsibilities of American citizenship, by practicing the principles of democracy in school, and by knowing and serving the community.¹¹

10. *Education for Victory*, April 15, 1942, pp. 3f. Since this report concerned high school students, it is further discussed in Chapter IV.

11. *Ibid.*, pp. 5 ff.

In a statement on "Educational Policy Concerning Young Children and the War" the Commission sought "with other related agencies to guarantee for all children adequate *protection*, intelligent *participation*, and balanced *perspective*."¹²

A brief "Preliminary Statement on Vocational Training and the War" dealt with the adjustment of public vocational schools which began in July, 1940, to meet emergency defense and war production training needs, and the further adjustments needed under war conditions for industrial production, for the "Food for Freedom" agricultural war production program, for home economics training services, and training for business occupations. For industrial production it was stated that

The vocational schools are ready to extend this retraining [of workers dislocated from non-defense industries] on short notice wherever tools and housing can be provided for the purpose. The vocational war production training program should be expanded to the extent of carrying the training still further into industry for the purpose of utilizing more of the facilities of industry itself in a war production training program.

All vocational school equipment should be used to capacity so that every training station which will contribute to training for wartime production shall be in total use.¹³

The last recommendation was put into actual practice and the equipment of vocational schools was used for twenty-four hours a day for seven days a week.

The contribution that teachers could make to the war effort were discussed in a report on "Noncurriculum Tasks for Members of School Staffs." The professional and specialized training of teachers and school administrators could be utilized for the following reasons and in the following ways:

The training and experience of school staffs are of special value in influencing, directing, and leading groups as well as in other services where specialized knowledge and skills are essential. To use teachers for services that can be rendered without such training is a waste of ability. In planning teacher participation, school administrators should distinguish between assigned duties on the one hand and volunteer work on the other.

12. *Ibid.*, pp. 8 f.

13. *Ibid.*, p. 9.

Such activities would include service on community or neighborhood planning council or committee; teacher training; temporary professional service in registration and classification; leadership in children's activities centering in the school; and community organization and leadership.¹⁴ Paradoxically, at the same meeting that the Commission discussed suggestions of noncurriculum war tasks in which teachers might engage, it was also confronted with the problem of the supply and demand of teachers, and the increasing shortage which was already beginning to be recognized as one of the crucial issues in education during the war.¹⁵

At its meeting on April 24, 1942, the Wartime Commission issued a call to school authorities to keep schools open during the summer and to consider how personnel, plant, and equipment might be used to contribute to war service training courses. Among the activities recommended was the provision of day and evening summer training courses for pupils of secondary school and adult levels, in such areas as the following: mathematics, science, English, and social studies adapted to the specific needs of the armed forces and war production; aviation education; courses to train girls and women in business, trade and clerical occupations to replace men drawn into the armed forces; courses in home nursing, nutrition, first aid, and other fields related to civilian defense and other war needs; courses in physical fitness; training in cooperation with the Office of Civilian Defense for air raid wardens, auxiliary fire and police officers, and such other personnel as might be needed.

In addition to these training courses, the school authorities were urged to consider the following services that might be rendered to their communities:

1. To set up information service offices in certain strategic school buildings in urban and rural communities to provide in collaboration with the Office of Civilian Defense and other Government agencies information in reference to such aspects of the war effort as selective service, opportunities for training, recreation. This office might be operated by volunteer personnel recruited from qualified persons.

14. *Ibid.*, p. 10.

15. The issue is discussed in some detail on pp. 61 ff.

2. To carry on programs of salvage and conservation during the summer months under the direction of school personnel.

3. To continue the promotion and sale of war savings stamps and bonds.

4. To establish additional provision for nursery schools, kindergartens, playgrounds, or other informal groups in areas where mothers are employed and small children are neglected. Programs for this purpose may be worked out cooperatively with P. T. A. or recreation and child guidance departments and may involve the use of volunteer student personnel under competent direction.

5. To make buildings available through the cooperation of appropriate community organizations for social events and entertainment for service men and war workers.

6. To make buildings available for housing youth engaged in farm work and other groups of war workers, and for housing service men on leave.

7. To make buildings available to organizations such as the Red Cross, defense groups, to carry on training activities essential to war effort.

8. To make available play facilities, particularly swimming pools, gymnasiums, and playgrounds for community use.

9. To make school buses available, where regulations permit, for all types of transportation necessary to the war effort.

10. To cooperate with the National Government in rendering services such as registration for selective service, and commodity rationing.

11. To organize groups of young people to continue the cultivation of victory gardens under proper supervision.

12. To make school kitchens and cafeterias available for canning and preserving of fruits and vegetables.

13. To make school library service available to pupils and to the general public for recreational reading and war information.

14. To cooperate with the U. S. Employment Service and other agencies in guiding students of work age to engage in some occupation during the vacation period that will help the war effort, especially to assist in recruiting, training, and supervising young people for war work.

15. To organize musical, dramatic, and other talent from the personnel of the school and community to provide entertainment and recreation for service men and the general public.

16. To encourage a program of medical examination and correction for boys and girls of high school age with a view to preparing

them for war services. This service should be extended especially to those who are likely to enter war services during the ensuing year.

17. To make preliminary preparation for converting school buildings in exposed areas as required for use as first aid or hospital centers in the event of air raids or epidemics.¹⁶

Further reports and recommendations on the problems which faced education in wartime were presented and discussed by the Wartime Commission at the meeting held on July 22, 1942. The Commission's committee on secondary education recommended the "substitution of war programs for usual peacetime programs, school control of student organization activities, and establishment in every high school of an overall war service organization enrolling all pupils contributing to civil defense, war savings, salvage, conservation, or preparing for service in the armed forces or war related occupations." The general principle to guide such activities was stated as follows:

Education must help individuals to prepare for participation in all phases of the war effort and must not emphasize one aspect of participation to the exclusion of, or out of proportion to other phases. Victory will come as a result of giving each element in the prosecution of total warfare, whether in the sphere of military combat, of production, or of ideas, its proper place and emphasis.¹⁷

The Commission approved recommendations for extending federal, state, and local policies for the care and education of young children of working mothers and for the guidance of mothers.

In order to promote closer cooperation between federal agencies and the states, state wartime commissions began to be organized soon after Pearl Harbor. Among the functions to be undertaken by state wartime commissions were the following:

1. Implementing, in the States and local communities, requests from national emergency wartime agencies for assistance through the schools, such as: rationing, by the Office of Price Administration; salvage, by the War Production Board; defense activities, by the Office of Civilian Defense; sale of stamps and bonds, by the Treasury Department.

16. *Ibid.*, May 15, 1942, p. 6.

17. *Ibid.*, August 15, 1942, p. 6.

2. Carrying out suggestions from national sources involving changes in the school curriculum and schedules, such as those relating to preflight aviation training, health education, and nutrition education.

3. Serving as a clearing house for national, State, and local policies and activities as these affect education.

4. Dealing with dislocations caused by the impact of the war on social and educational conditions, as the teacher supply, transportation, farm and industrial labor, and enlistment of high-school students.

5. Cooperating with States and local agencies and groups engaged in the war effort when they are confronted with problems that have educational implications.

6. Assuming leadership in sponsoring or urging appropriate agencies to sponsor publications, conferences, institutes, and other promotional activities that relate education to wartime conditions and needs.¹⁸

In general, the state wartime commissions were expected to serve as links between the U. S. Office of Education Wartime Commission and wartime educational activities in their respective areas, to suggest problems to be considered and to discuss recommendations made by the central agency. It was intended to spread throughout the country a network of organizations reaching from Washington to the local education authorities to concentrate all activities on the adaptation of education to war needs. After the middle of 1942 little more appeared about the central or local commissions.

On the occasion of the Seventy-fifth Anniversary of U. S. Office of Education, March, 1942, the National Education Association issued a statement, "The U. S. Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, Its Wartime Services," which listed the following activities:

(1) Training skilled workers for industrial production through regular trade courses, emergency defense training, and stimulating the provision and use of school plants by state and local authorities. (2) Training engineers, chemists, physicians, and production managers under the Engineering, Science, and Management Defense Training Program authorized by Congress. (3)

18. *Ibid.*, July 15, 1942, p. 7.

Administering and subsidizing a vocational agricultural education program, operated through state boards for vocational education to increase the production of "food for freedom" and to provide training in the repair of farm machinery. (4) Training for business, especially in distributive occupations, to supply trained civilian personnel to replace those drawn into the armed forces as well as for the needs of the Army and Navy. (5) Training for homemaking with special emphasis on better nutrition, school lunches, consumer problems arising from rationing, and instruction in home nursing, health, and child care. (6) Vocational rehabilitation. (7) Creation of the Wartime Commission. (8) Production of teaching films to speed up training for war industries. (9) Coordinating the efforts of schools, colleges, universities, and libraries through the Civilian Morale Service to help citizens understand "what this war means to us and our future." (10) Cooperation with the State Department and the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs in promoting better understanding of our Inter-American neighbors through the exchange of students and teachers, organizing demonstration centers for experiments in courses of study and teaching, and organizing traveling school exhibits and loan packets. (11) Certifying the need of funds for emergency school buildings and costs of operation in "boom towns" created by the expansion of war industries. (12) Cooperation with the Treasury Department in preparing materials for use in schools on defense savings stamps and related education. (13) Assistance in the development of plans for training policemen, firemen and other volunteers for community service. (14) Cooperation with the Civil Aeronautics Administration and a Joint Advisory Committee "to coordinate aims, review plans and proposals, and promote rapid progress in aviation education throughout the American schools. (15) Establishment of a school garden service in cooperation with the programs of the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services and the Department of Agriculture to promote victory gardening. (16) Development and promotion of a program on nutrition and school lunches. (17) Preparation of radio scripts and transcriptions bearing mainly on the war emergency, supplied on request to local schools and stations. (18) Administration of a program for building model airplanes by pupils in public and private high

schools according to plans and specifications printed by the U. S. Navy. (19) Collection and distribution of packets of pamphlets, courses of study, outlines, etc., intended to disseminate information on education and the war and to keep educational planning abreast of latest developments. (20) Planning for post-war readjustments based on programs of the National Resources Planning Board and the Public Works Reserve. (21) Publication of *Education for Victory*. Publication of a series on education and national defense as practical guides for meeting the crisis. The series included pamphlets on teaching and practicing democracy and problems of democratic living in school and community, the protection of children against war propaganda and needless strain, the proper feeding of school children, precautions against possible air raids during school hours, effective use of school facilities in community organization, evacuation procedures, if such became necessary, of school children and other problems. The list of war services of the U. S. Office of Education, issued by the National Education Association, concludes with the following general summary:

Practically the entire Office of Education staff has been shifted to wartime duties. Facilitating the Government rationing program, study of problems involved in possible evacuation of school children, accelerated training of doctors, dentists, and pharmacists, and many other projects are being prosecuted with energy and success by the Federal service arm for education.

This analysis of the war services of the U. S. Office of Education furnishes the most revealing illustration of the effects of total war on a nation's education. "You're in the Army now" was a slogan which affected every educational institution of the country at every level as well as all citizens at all ages. In the atmosphere created by total war the normal process of education could not be continued. Nevertheless, at some stage of the educational organization some thought might have been given to the postwar needs of the nation and to the maintenance and preservation of some of the normal objectives of education. Indirectly perhaps, the constant emphasis on the adjustment of the schools to the exigencies of war, although it was not the only cause, may have contributed to swell the numbers of youth and teachers

who left the schools. The Back-to-School Drives came too late to impress youth with the importance of remaining in school in the interests of themselves and of the nation. The exodus of teachers from the schools was to create problems, the seriousness of which was to be felt acutely in the years immediately following the war.

The emphasis on immediate and direct adjustment of education to war needs was not limited to the U. S. Office of Education alone. It was endorsed by seven hundred directors of the national war effort and leading educational officials from the forty-eight states when they met in a four-day National Institute on Education and the War, which was held in Washington, August 28 to 31, 1942. In a statement on "The Work of the Schools in Relation to the War" a committee appointed by the president of the Chief State School Officers stated that

Education must make its special and particular contribution to the struggle. Fighting with learning is the slogan of victory. . . . Never was there a time when educational workers faced heavier responsibilities for adjusting the school program to a great national need. Never was there a time when these workers might take greater pride in the significance of their work, never a better opportunity to serve young children, and the nation. . . . There is not time to be overly strict in definitions regarding the functions of education.¹⁹

It was accordingly agreed that school programs must be modified to provide opportunities for curricular and extracurricular activities, for health service, and community service programs in order to prepare the high school student body to meet the demands of the armed forces, industry, and the community. The modifications recommended followed in general those already discussed and suggested by committees of the U. S. Office of Education Wartime Commission:

The curricular programs should, it was proposed, provide for (a) courses in arithmetic, algebra, geometry, general mathematics, and, in some cases trigonometry, drawing problems from aviation, navigation, mechanized warfare, and industry; (b) courses in industrial arts related to war needs and special application to

19. National Institute on Education and the War. *Handbook on Education and the War*. Washington, D. C., 1942, p. xiii.

the operation of tools; (c) courses in auto mechanics with particular emphasis on the repair and operation of trucks, tractors, and automobiles; (d) practical courses in home economics, especially home care of the sick, nutrition, child care, cooking, sewing, and home management to assist home living under war conditions; (e) courses in physics, especially mechanics, heat, radio, photography, and electricity; (f) unit on health; (g) revised social study course on war aims and issues and including actual experience in community undertakings; (h) one or more units of study on the armed forces to provide general understanding and to lessen the time required for induction; (i) preflight courses in larger schools; (j) instruction to develop an appreciation of the implications of the global concept of the present war and of post-war living.

In the *extracurricular activities* provision was to be made for (a) school lunches and proper nutrition of children; (b) assembly programs to give children appreciation of the fact that they have a definite part to play in the defense of the country; (c) cooperation with such organizations as the Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts, Campfire Girls, 4-H clubs, Junior Red Cross, and Future Farmers of America; (d) student councils and similar organizations to train through active participation in the American way of life.

Health services were recommended to provide for (a) correction of physical defects as early and as often as possible; and (b) physical fitness programs to increase the bodily vigor of youth.

The *Community Service* programs suggested included provision for (a) promoting salvage drives, home assistance, farm labor, home gardens, and other community undertakings; (b) cooperation with other community agencies engaged in lessening juvenile delinquency due to homes broken or disrupted through army service, employment changes, and other causes; (c) utilization of every opportunity to give parents an appreciation of the schools serving youth; (d) developing a feeling of security by teachers and others in American ideals; (e) cooperating with existing defense agencies; (f) assisting and promoting understanding in consumer buying; (g) using library facilities to make available materials and services to enable the people to reach intelligent decisions on war and postwar issues.

Finally, it was recommended that *Guidance Services* should

provide, (2) information as to all opportunities and demands for the services of youth in the war effort; (b) an inventory of the abilities, aptitudes, and present training of youth to enable them to gauge their best field of service; (c) counseling to aid youth in deciding on their most useful participation in the war effort and consequent choice of training.²⁰

How schools, colleges, and teachers responded to the suggestions and recommendations which came from their representative professional organizations and leaders was presented in the following statement, "Education's Part in the War Effort," issued by the National Education Association.²¹

The schools and colleges of the United States made indispensable contributions to the nation's war effort. Among other things they

(1) Laid the foundations upon which a citizens' army was quickly built. In World War I only 20% of the members of the armed forces had more than an eighth-grade education; in World War II almost 70% had more than an eighth-grade education.

(2) Gave at least 70,000 teachers to the armed services. The educational and visual instruction programs of the military forces were largely manned by former teachers.

(3) Provided facilities and personnel for training officers and specialists. The Army's college training programs graduated 64,332 men between April 1943 and December 1945. The Navy's college training programs graduated 219,150 persons.

(4) Carried through a training program designed to increase industrial production and the supply of food. Pre-employment courses were given to 2,667,000, supplementary vocational courses to 4,800,000, and agricultural training to 4,188,000 students.

(5) Registered millions of men for the Selective Service. In most communities school buildings were used and thousands of teachers voluntarily gave time as registration clerks.

(6) Registered citizens and distributed 415,000,000 ration books. Many teachers served on the rationing boards—in August 1945, of the 126,000 board members nearly 7600 were educators.

(7) Participated in the drives to collect waste paper and metal. Out of 25,000,000 tons of paper collected, it is estimated by authorities that the schools collected at least 2,500,000 tons.

(8) Sold two billion dollars worth of war bonds and stamps. In

20. *Ibid.*, p. xiv.

21. *Public and Education*, Vol. 1, No. 6, March 21, 1946; also in the *Journal of the National Education Association*, May, 1946, p. 250.

1945 more than 25,000,000 pupils were participating in school savings plans as compared to 2,500,000 in 1941.

(9) Provided headquarters for civilian defense activities. Partial reports from city school systems indicate that one in ten teachers participated in such activities.

(10) Assisted the Junior Red Cross produce over 35,000,000 comfort and recreational articles for the armed forces. In addition, medical chests, dried milk, and educational gift boxes were sent to children in the war zones.

(11) Gave thousands of hours to war-supporting agencies. Among these were the United Service Organizations, American Red Cross, war relief drives for our Allies, book drives of the American Library Association, and nursery schools and child-care programs.

The country could be proud of the contributions made by schools, colleges, and teachers to the war effort. There was, however, another side to the picture. From the nature of the statement no reference could be made to the tribulations of teachers in high schools who saw their classes in those subjects which were not regarded as directly contributory to the war effort, that is, the academic subjects, gradually deserted in favor of more immediately practical subjects, and who found themselves assigned to teach subjects for which they had no preparation. Nor is there any indication in these records of the educational and physical deficiencies revealed by the Selective Service, or of the growing seriousness of the teacher shortage during the war years.

The teachers of the country responded nobly and willingly to the pledge of the American Association of School Administrators at its meeting in San Francisco in February, 1942, of "full support to the all-out effort of our nation to defeat the enemies of free people and free institutions." They carried out fully the call made by Paul V. McNutt, Administrator, Federal Security Agency, to the teachers in American schools and colleges, which read as follows:

From my point of view, the maintenance of a sound program of education during this war period is exceedingly important in the interest of national welfare. Furthermore, in connection with such a program, an almost endless number of essential wartime services can be rendered to the pupils and to the community by the teachers.

Teachers who utilize their positions to help pupils and adults in

the community to develop and maintain vigorous health, to possess skills essential to wartime production and services, to understand the issues involved in the war, and to exemplify determination to cooperate in all the efforts to win the war and to establish a lasting peace at its close, have a right to feel that they are engaged in one of the most important wartime services available to any citizen of the United States.²²

In an address before the National Education Association's Assembly, Indianapolis, June 29, 1943, the U. S. Commissioner of Education, John W. Studebaker, paid a tribute to the members of the teaching profession at all levels.

Today, he said, the schools of democracy are indeed the citadels of citizenship, front line redoubts in the fight for the preservation of freedom. And being such, the contribution of the schools and colleges of America to the war effort has been, is now, and will continue to be a magnificent source of strength to the Nation in its time of mortal trial.²³

Schools and colleges had provided "the basic underpinning for the competence of a democratic people." Compared with World War I, when only 4 per cent of the members of the armed forces were high school graduates, the percentage in World War II was 25 per cent. The speedy training of huge armies had been made possible by the trained intelligence, resourcefulness, and adaptability cultivated by the schools, while the development of technical education had produced the high level of competence and skills of millions of workers and the professional and scientific knowledge which made possible the mobilization of the whole economy of the nation in support of the war effort. From 1940 on, new contributions had been made through the training of other millions of workers for defense and war production, through preinduction training founded on basic general education in mathematics and natural sciences, English, history and other social studies, physical education, art, music, and languages, and through postinduction training. Certain adjustments had to be made "in the curriculums pursued by young men who are destined in a short time for service in the armed forces to better prepare them for the responsibilities which will soon be theirs."

22. *Education for Victory*, May 1, 1942, p. 1.

23. *Ibid.*, July 15, 1943, p. 1.

Sincere and earnest discussion of the kind of postwar world should be encouraged; the immediate demands, however, should not be ignored, since

Education dare not during the exigencies of war neglect the present for the future. In our concern to descry the features of the potentially free and peaceful postwar world of the future we must not relax the doing now of those things that are imperative if we are to win the war, the winning of which will alone make that future world possible.²⁴

After listing the contributions of teachers to the war effort in the daily work of the schools, in community services, and in civilian defense activities, Dr. Studebaker emphasized as the most important of all contributions made by schools and colleges the building of firm intellectual and spiritual foundations of American democracy, love of country, knowledge of our history and traditions, integration of common knowledge and attitudes, and instilling a deep appreciation of the nation's heritage. They contributed "the faith and fortitude which are the distinguishing characteristics of fighting Americans."

Faith and fortitude—these make up morale; a morale based on understanding and shot through with the moral dynamic of a belief in righteousness, justice, and equality of opportunity among men. In our homes and churches and schools was born and nurtured the spiritual compulsion to sacrificial action in the common cause.²⁵

This and other tributes to the teachers and the educational system of the country were well deserved. Nor in view of the post-war unrest in the teaching profession could the opportunity of directing the attention of the public to their contributions both in the years preceding and during the war be overlooked. Nevertheless, there was some danger that the emphasis on "What is right with the schools" might overshadow some of the educational deficiencies which were revealed during the war. Among these the most glaring deficiencies were the percentage of illiteracy, the number of rejections under the Selective Service System for mental and physical disabilities, the shortage of trained personnel in certain academic subjects essential for war needs, the failure to provide equality of educational opportunities, and the low economic status of teachers.

24. *Ibid.*, p. 3.

25. *Ibid.*, p. 4.

CHAPTER THREE

EDUCATIONAL DEFICIENCIES REVEALED BY THE WAR

MENTAL AND PHYSICAL DEFICIENCIES

THE most startling deficiency revealed during the war years was the existence of large numbers of American citizens who were illiterate in the sense that they could not read or write, or who were functionally illiterate in the sense that they were unable to understand what they read. The census of 1920 showed that 7.1 per cent of the population over twenty-one years of age were "unable to write in any language, regardless of their ability to read"; by 1930 the figure had dropped to 5.3 per cent. The question on literacy was replaced in 1940 by a request for information on "the highest grade of school completed." Of 73,725,819 persons over twenty-five years of age 2,799,923 or 3.8 per cent had not completed even one year of school, while 7,304,689 or 9.9 per cent had completed from one to four years, giving a total of 10,104,612 or 13.7 per cent of those twenty-five years of age or over with less than five years of schooling. The distribution of the population in the country with only one to four years of school completed was as follows: New England States, 10.3 per cent; Middle Atlantic States, 12.4 per cent; East North Central States, 9.2 per cent; West North Central States, 7.5 per cent; South Atlantic States, 23.4 per cent; East South Central States, 25 per cent; West South Central States, 21.7 per cent; Mountain States, 11.1 per cent; and Pacific States, 7.5 per cent.

Reports from the Selective Service revealed that 676,000 men were rejected for mental or educational deficiencies, which meant that they had less than the four years of schooling which was set up as the standard of functional literacy. Of the registrants for the draft, 350,000 signed their names with a mark. In addition to those rejected, large numbers were drafted into the army with such meager education that training had to be pro-

vided for them in the basic literary skills. According to a report of the Development and Special Training Section, Training Branch, Adjutant General's Office of the War Department, special training had to be provided for five groups of men: (1) For the largest group of English-speaking men who were literate or semi-literate training was provided to make them proficient in the three R's to succeed as soldiers. (2) A non-English-speaking group, illiterate in their own native languages, was taught in special training units, although some were of such low-grade ability that it was not expected that they would be successful in the army. (3) Another non-English speaking group with almost negligible ability to read and write English but literate in their own languages was given a carefully graded program. (4) A group, which, although literate, had a capacity less than that required in regular training units had to be taught in special training units. (5) A group with minor physical defects was trained for useful work. The problem demanded the careful selection and preparation of instructors in a special training unit organized by the Armed Forces Institute, the construction of tests to facilitate accuracy in the selection and grouping of the illiterates, and the preparation of textbooks and other materials. The majority of those who needed training completed the required course in eight weeks; others needed the maximum of thirteen weeks. A small number, lacking the qualifications for military service, received honorable discharge.

Equally serious was the number rejected on account of physical deficiencies. The gravity of this situation was summarized in a statement in *Our Children*, Annual Report of the Profession to the Public by the Executive Secretary of the National Education Association (Washington, D. C., 1946), as follows:

As many men were lost to the U. S. military services in World War II on account of physical unfitness as our country had under arms in all theaters of World War I. These physical and educational inadequacies were as much a handicap to war production as they were to military efficiency. They are as great a liability in peace as in war (p. 5).

According to a report by Colonel Leonard G. Rowntree, Chief, Medical Division, Selective Service System, one million

out of two million registrants were rejected on account of physical deficiencies; and at the time of the report the figures had not fallen below 30 per cent, while the rejection rate even in the eighteen-nineteen year-old group was 25.4 per cent.¹ Almost two years later Colonel Rowntree stated, in a paper presented at a meeting of the Chief State School Officers, that .

The greatest internal national problem of the American people, after complete victory in World War II, concerns the health of the American people, their physical and mental fitness for their present and postwar responsibilities. This extends to the whole population but, with an eye to the future, it concerns particularly the children. This involves the question of early training and education. The fact is we cannot begin too early. The home and the school must both take their places in laying the foundations of the program.

This applies to the mental hygiene as well as to the physical hygiene of the individual. More and more we see how the mind and body are closely interdependent. We are coming to realize more and more this mental element in physical fitness.²

The war had uncovered some hitherto unheeded weaknesses, including not only the numbers rejected for physical unfitness but also the high rate of discharges from military service on certificates of disability. To these facts must be added the cost of setting up programs for rehabilitation and physical conditioning of those inducted. The principal cause of rejection of 4,458,000 registrants (3,588,000 white and 870,000 Negro), eighteen to thirty-seven years of age in class 4-F and classes with F designation as of December 1, 1944, were given in the following table:

Principal causes for rejection	Total	Number		Per Cent		
		White	Negro	Total	White	Negro
Manifestly disqualifying defects	469,300	405,800	63,500	10 5	11 3	7 3
Mental diseases.	759,600	671,000	88,600	17 1	18 7	10 2
Mental deficiency	620,100	340,700	279,400	13 9	9 5	32 1
Physical defects	2,542,000	2,116,600	425,400	57 9	59 0	48 9
Nonmedical.	67,000	53,900	13,100	1 5	1.5	1 5

The nation, concluded Colonel Rowntree, had failed to recognize the importance of health and physical fitness, and the sit-

1. *Education for Victory*, June 1, 1943, p. 3.

2. *Ibid.*, January 20, 1945, p. 5.

uation which he described was the result of indifference and apathy on the part of the public, the government (federal, state, and municipal), parents, teachers, churches, the medical and dental professions, and of youth itself. A Joint Committee on Physical Fitness, created in 1944 by the American Medical Association, recommended the initiation of a health and physical fitness program to include the following:

- (1) Preadmission physical examination at 5 years.
- (2) Periodic examination at 2- to 3-year intervals thereafter.
- (3) Education in the principles of healthful living.
- (4) One hour daily for physical training.
- (5) Credits for satisfactory progress.
- (6) Accumulative health and physical fitness records.
- (7) Provision for adequate personnel facilities and time for such a program.³

The conditions of illiteracy and physical unfitness revealed during the war years aroused considerable consternation in both public and professional circles. It is characteristic of American education, however, to push forward and to ignore weakness revealed in the educational fabric. That many pupils somehow are advanced into the high schools with only fourth or fifth grade ability in reading and arithmetic was a fact known to educators for some years before the war. Further, there is the anomaly that more research studies on the teaching of reading and the correction of reading disabilities have been published in this country than anywhere else in the world. There is, however, a complacency which, resulting from the increasing enrollments in high schools and colleges, leads to a tendency to overlook the weaknesses in the educational system. The same situation prevailed in the matter of health and physical fitness. The discussions at the White House Conference on "Child Health and Protection," 1930, showed that inadequate attention was devoted to these important aspects of individual and national well-being on the part of parents, schools, and the medical profession, and especially to children who had already begun to attend school. Instruction in health has been given an important place in the curriculum, both of elementary and secondary schools during

3. *Ibid.*, pp. 6 f.

the past twenty-five years. The fact is that the United States in the matter of school medical inspection lags far behind many other countries; while the provision of medical treatment, as the essential counterpart of a sound system of school medical inspection and of public policy, is virtually nonexistent.

A program of physical fitness through physical education to meet the wartime needs of young people and plans for the preparation of teachers to carry out the program was prepared under the direction of the U. S. Office of Education by a committee of educators in collaboration with the U. S. Army and Navy, the U. S. Public Health Service, and the Children's Bureau. The statement was further amplified in a report prepared by the National Science-Teachers Organizations in cooperation with the U. S. Office of Education and the Pre-Induction Training Branch of the War Department. The report dealt not only with the health needs of prospective soldiers but with a program for postinduction health provisions. This was followed by a statement issued by the U. S. Office of Education on "Minimum Standards on Equipment and Supplies for Physical Fitness in Schools and Colleges" to meet "All-time Needs for Good Health and Fitness."⁴

THE CARE OF CHILDREN

Two urgent problems arose directly out of the war conditions as they affected the care of children and youth. The withdrawal of men to the armed services and of men and women to war industries had a serious effect upon the American home. Provision had to be made for the care of young children of preschool age and of children and youth out of school hours in homes where the mothers were engaged in war work.

The Wartime Commission of the U. S. Office of Education directed its attention from its first meeting on to the statement of an educational policy concerning young children and the war. The policy, defined by a subcommittee of specialists representing the National Commission for Young Children, the U. S. Office of Education, the American Association of University Women, and the Association of Childhood Education,

4. See *Education for Victory*, June 15, 1943, pp. 1 ff.; January 3, 1944, pp. 9 ff.; January 20, 1944, pp. 11 ff.

emphasized the importance of providing adequate protection of children, intelligent participation in activities related to the war effort, and a balanced perspective on the meaning of the war for American democracy.⁵

It was early recognized that young children (two to five years of age) in defense areas were "gravely in need of a happy, well-ordered place to play, regular food and rest, and the security and well-being that result from well-planned programs conducted by trained personnel." There were not enough nursery schools or kindergartens to meet the needs, which became more acute with the increasing employment of women in industries. Nor was there an adequate supply of trained teachers for the work that was demanded. In order to concentrate all the forces of the country concerned with the care of young children, the National Commission for Young Children was formed early in 1942, sponsored by the National Association for Nursery Education, the American Association of University Women, the Association for Childhood Education, and the Progressive Education Association. One of the first tasks undertaken by the new Commission was to stimulate the extension of existing provisions for young children through the assistance of volunteer aides trained in short-term programs and teaching under the supervision of trained teachers. Programs for the registration and training of volunteer aides were immediately developed throughout the country. The short-term courses were offered by colleges and universities, public school systems, or organizations concerned with the education and welfare of children and their families. The courses included general orientation into nursery school practice, physical growth and development of children, nutrition, play, habit formation, types of emergency situations, community responsibilities and services, and observation and practice.⁶

In the summer of 1942 conferences for workers with young children were organized in many colleges and universities, in which three essentials were emphasized:

First, that the guidance and protection of young children is a joint responsibility of education, health, and welfare agencies, and oppor-

5. *Education for Victory*, April 15, 1942, pp. 8 f.

6. *Ibid.*, pp. 25 f., and p. 32.

tunities should be provided for workers in these fields to exchange ideas. *Second*, that preparation opportunities should be included for parents and volunteer workers who offer to serve as nursery aides in nursery schools, kindergartens, and primary school programs. And, *third*, that workers are responsible for helping the community understand children's needs for guidance and care in both peacetime and wartime, and for helping to provide adequate programs to meet the needs.⁷

The effects of war conditions upon the development of the program for young children were revealed in reports for June, 1942, received from 1,067 nursery schools and privately supported kindergartens. The conduct of the program was seriously affected by transportation difficulties due to gas and tire rationing, by the difficulties of adjusting time-schedules to those of working mothers, by increases in enrollments requiring larger buildings and more playground space, by the lack of competent personnel and of funds for paid directors, and by changes in the home conditions due to restlessness, unguarded conversations about the war, and long separation of children from parents during the day. The last of these imposed upon the teachers a responsibility "to exercise special care in maintaining routines and giving children a feeling of 'belonging' and of security."⁸

One of the serious difficulties in meeting the urgent need of providing for the care of children of working mothers was financial. Not only was the supply of child care centers inadequate, but of 1,013 reporting in the middle of 1942 two-thirds charged tuition. At its meeting on July 22, 1942, the Wartime Commission approved recommendations for extending federal, state, and local policies for the care and education of young children and for the coordination of federal activities dealing with the care of children of working mothers. It was urged that federal funds be provided for the protection and guidance of two- to six-year-old children whose mothers were doing war work. The need for further study of the problems affecting young children in war-affected areas was emphasized. A section had already been created in the Office of Defense, Health, and Welfare Services to integrate and coordinate the day-care activi-

7. *Ibid.*, June 15, 1942, p. 9.

8. *Ibid.*, July 15, 1942, p. 24.

ties of various federal agencies interested in the care of children of working mothers. The plans of the section included requests for grants-in-aid to states for the day-care program and the allocation of the funds on the basis of certification of the federal agency concerned with the specific program proposed. At the same time the Wartime Commission urged state wartime commissions to encourage local communities, particularly in defense areas, to provide care for preschool children and children of school age, the U. S. Office of Education coordinating the programs and furnishing materials and advisory field service.⁹

By the end of 1942 it had become increasingly apparent that the provision of extended school services for children and youth was an urgent need. By that time four and a half million mothers were engaged in war work, and it was expected that the number would increase to six million. The prior concern was for the preschool children; extended school services for older children after school hours was to become a concern as juvenile delinquency increased. In addition to the normal aims of the nursery schools, their need became particularly urgent during the war, when it was realized that "To the working mother the nursery school offers peace of mind concerning the welfare of her young children, thus freeing her to work efficiently. So it is that nursery schools for young children have become a matter of hard common sense, a practical war necessity."¹⁰ According to a directive issued by the War Manpower Commission, it should be noted, no women with children were to be encouraged to work "until after all other sources of labor supply have been exhausted, but that, if such women are employed, adequate provision for the care of such children will facilitate their employment."¹¹

On August 24, 1942, President Roosevelt allocated \$400,000 from his emergency fund to the Office of Defense, Health, and Welfare Services of the Federal Security Agency to provide "for administrative services necessary for ascertaining needs, developing and coordinating day-care services, and administering state or local day-care programs, not including personnel for the operation of nursery schools or day-care centers or cost of

9. *Ibid.*, August 15, 1942, pp. 5 f.

10. *Ibid.*, September 15, 1942, p. 70.

11. *Ibid.*, November 16, 1942, p. 13.

maintenance of children in nursery schools, day-care centers, or foster-family day-care homes. "The administration of the fund was assigned to the U. S. Office of Education, working through state welfare departments. The fund was to be used to encourage the care of children two to five years of age in nursery schools and kindergartens, and school children five to fourteen years of age through extended school programs for ten to twelve hours a day, every day in the week. Where local or state funds were not available for these purposes, they could be obtained under the Lanham Act upon the certification of need by the U. S. Office of Education to the Federal Works Agency which administered the Act.¹²

The emergency fund was effective in stimulating nationwide interest in the problem of the care of children. Not only did departments of education and welfare departments in most of the states of the country apply for aid, but state legislatures in 1943 provided additional funds to secure personnel to advise and counsel, to purchase food, to finance maintenance services, and for capital outlays. Provision for the care of children was regarded as urgent in order to release women for essential war work and to prevent children of working mothers becoming casualties of the war.¹³

The progress of the movement to provide for the care of young children and extended school services for older children was carried on under certain difficulties. Classes were too large; schools were conducted for half-days only without suitable arrangements for the supervision of children out of school hours; failure to adapt programs to the experiences of the children was noted; and a dearth of adequately prepared teachers and a draining of teachers from rural areas to the cities created other problems. To meet the need of teachers, in-service and refresher short courses and institutes were sponsored by colleges and school systems with aid from state education departments. School lunch programs were operating in many communities and through the extended school services the idea of the schoolhouse as a community center was being developed. As part of the extended school services there had been an increase of teen-age

12. *Ibid.*, October 15, 1942, p. 1.

13. *Ibid.*, September 15, 1943, p. 13.

canteens and special supervised programs in libraries, museums, and parks. On the other hand "neglected children, truancy, and delinquency," it was reported, "make a mounting problem of great proportions."¹⁴

At a conference of representatives of the Association for Childhood Education with staff members of the U. S. Office of Education, held in Washington, D. C., on April 18, 1944, reports on the progress of extended school services were presented. The following points were emphasized in the reports: Programs for children were reaching only a small proportion of the children in the community who need the services. Community resources, such as the use of libraries, museums, and other local services were not sufficiently tapped. Extended school services were being operated in some instances apart from instead of being coordinated with the regular school organization and program. No pattern had been developed for the extended school programs with an overemphasis on some activities (arts, crafts, games and athletics) almost to the exclusion of other activities (hobbies, sciences, dramatics, and clubs). Since teachers were recruited from regular teaching staffs, the load of the extra services in the regular school year and summer sessions proved too heavy a burden for them. Extensive publicity devices had been developed to enlist the interest of parents and community groups.¹⁵ In-service training had been provided for teachers and courses organized for volunteers, both adult and high-school youth. "Special emphasis was laid on the need for immediate planning and organizing of summer programs for children in the community, and for extending the service."¹⁶

The importance of extended school services for children of

14. *Ibid.*, May 20, 1944, p. 7.

15. Among these should be mentioned the "School Children and the War Series," prepared and issued in 1943 by the U. S. Office of Education. The series included the following "leaflets": (1) "School Services for Children of Working Mothers"; (2) "All-Day School Programs for Children of Working Mothers"; (3) "Nursery Schools Vital to America's War Effort"; (4) "Food Time—a Good Time at School"; (5) "Training High-School Students for Wartime Service to Children"; (6) "Meeting Children's Emotional Disorders at School"; (7) "Recreation and Other Activities in the All-Day School Program"; (8) "Juvenile Delinquency and the Schools in Wartime."

16. *Ibid.*, May 20, 1944, p. 8.

preschool as well as of school age in a permanent national scheme of education was recognized in a resolution adopted by the National Council of Chief State School Officers at its annual meeting in Baltimore, Maryland, December 1-4, 1944, in which it was recommended that the federal government should "stimulate states to prepare and develop comprehensive state plans for educational programs, and it should participate, when necessary in the financing of such programs." Following a conference of nine national organizations in programs of education, health, and welfare of children, held in Washington, D. C., September 19-21, 1945, a summary of the findings of the conference was presented to President Truman. The organizations represented at this conference included the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation, American Association of University Women, Association for Childhood Education, American Home Economics Association, General Federation of Women's Clubs, National Association for Nursery Education, National Congress of Parents, and the National Education Association. Support was pledged for the following policies:

To meet their basic needs, children must have food of the quantity and quality that makes physical growth possible, clothing and shelter adequate for comfort and self-respect, recreation and care that guarantees the maximum physical and mental health.

Constructive planning for children is one of the most important tasks which can be undertaken.

The financial cooperation of the Federal Government with the States and communities—a principle well established in Federal law—is necessary in order to obtain the services that will satisfy these needs.

All the children of all the people at all levels of development from conception to maturity should be included in community, state, and national programs of action—regardless of race, color, creed, nationality, or place of residence.

Programs for children should be coordinated.

American family life will be strengthened and enriched by services that assist the home in providing for the needs of children.¹⁷

The provision of nursery schools on an optional basis was included in all plans for the postwar reconstruction of education.

17. *School Life*, February, 1946, p. 10.

Interest declined, however, in the first postwar years or was directed to problems of teacher shortage and salaries, and federal aid for education.

CHILD LABOR

That conditions of a total war tend to disrupt the normal conduct of education was clearly brought out by the difficulties in keeping older children in school and in the satisfactory administration of child labor laws. These difficulties increased as the war continued and as the supply of man power decreased, and became acute in 1944. The situation was described in the report, "Adjustments in School Attendance and Child Labor Provisions to Meet Wartime Needs," presented by a special committee of the Study Commission on State Educational Policies of the National Council of Chief State School Officers. Child labor standards were being lowered or violated. Large numbers of children, particularly above the ages of fourteen or sixteen depending upon the state, tended to drop out of school. In many areas school attendance became increasingly irregular and unsatisfactory. Juvenile delinquency was increasing at an alarming rate. These conditions were due to man power shortage and wartime psychology.¹⁸ While it was recognized that the schools should help in every reasonable way to win the war, it was also realized as "shortsighted to permit the education of youth, which constitutes the bulwark of that democracy for which we are fighting, to be needlessly handicapped or weakened." More adjustments were needed than had been made, and a statement of principles to guide those responsible for local school programs was desirable. Among the most important of these principles were the following:

1. A primary objective of every school should be to encourage all students who can profit from further education to continue in school if at all possible, at least through the twelfth grade. To that end:

18. To this may perhaps be added the constant emphasis by the U. S. Office of Education on the participation of schools in the war effort and on vocational preparation, which was not balanced by an appropriate emphasis on the importance of all-round education for the postwar period.

(a) Needed adjustments should be made in the curriculum particularly in the upper grades to help to prepare youth for more constructive participation in the war effort.

(b) Adjustments should be made in school schedules, when necessary, to permit older youth who need to do so, to help meet emergency labor needs.

2. The value of desirable types of work-experience should be recognized and plans made to correlate work-experience more closely with the regular school program.

3. Demands for adjustments in school schedules or for children to discontinue their regular school work should be carefully evaluated, and decisions should be reached in light of all factors involved. The schools should be willing and ready to make adjustments, when necessary, but the necessity should be shown rather than taken for granted.¹⁹

The Children's Bureau reported that in the fiscal year 1942 there had been an increase of 132 per cent in the number of minors found illegally employed, and of these 75 per cent were under 16, 37 per cent under 14, and 12 per cent under 12, while "many were 10, 9, 8, and even younger." There had been a tendency to modify or ignore child labor laws in many states. The report recommended that the standards of the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (the Wage and Hour Law) be maintained with emergency adjustments carefully evaluated.

School attendance was irregular, and children were losing interest in school or dropping out. Here, too, school authorities were urged to maintain standards of attendance except where emergency adjustments were absolutely necessary. It was suggested that certificates of exemption should be granted only in emergency cases and never to pupils under fourteen. Limited credit for work experience might be given to pupils in senior high schools, but only if the work were carefully supervised and correlated with the school program. The demand for labor might be met by modifications of the school program to permit pupils to engage in emergency agricultural work, or by change of schedules with schools open on Saturdays or with shorter vacations or shorter school days at harvest time. No permits to work

19. *Education for Victory*, February 19, 1944, p. 2.

should be granted to elementary school pupils or pupils below a certain age, or to those not physically able or interested in farm work.²⁰

In November, 1944, in a plea to plan the employment of boys and girls in advance of the Christmas holidays, Katharine F. Lenroot, Chief of the Children's Bureau, took occasion to appeal for the strict observance of the child labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act and urged the cooperation of merchant and other business groups in the nation-wide Go-to-School Drive. Interest in this drive should be used, said Miss Lenroot, "to hold the line against the employment of school boys and girls at the expense of their health and schooling throughout the Christmas rush season. Good school and work programs for these youngsters should be worked out in advance by employers' groups and the schools."²¹

The Christmas rush season, however, provided the occasion for but was not the cause of the appeal. Child labor and violations of child labor provisions had been a matter of concern for some time. On January 3, 1944, a manifesto on child labor had been issued by thirty-four representatives of twenty-seven national organizations interested in educational and health problems affecting children and young people. The manifesto suggested nine lines of action:

1. Establishment of a local advisory council on child labor.
2. Organization of a stay-in-school campaign.
3. Initiation of action to extend vocational counseling services in schools.
4. A survey of the work school children are doing outside of school hours.
5. The development of cooperative programs of school supervised work.
6. Efforts to secure an adequate appropriation for child labor inspection and enforcement.
7. Conferences of employers, school officials, and social agencies to consider methods of dealing with child labor in specific industries, such as bowling alleys, that are especially serious in the community.

20. *Ibid.*, pp. 1 ff.

21. *Ibid.*, November 20, 1944, p. 31.

8. A study of the adequacy of health examinations given to minors entering employment.
9. Organization of discussion groups for employed young people.²²

JUVENILE DELINQUENCY

The disruptive effects of conditions of total war on social life were nowhere more clearly illustrated than in the increase in juvenile delinquency, which aroused considerable concern during the war years. The statistical evidence of this increase does not tell the whole story, however, since the available information presented only the numbers of children and youth who were brought before the juvenile courts. The total number of cases brought before such courts and reported to the Children's Bureau by eighty-two courts serving areas of 100,000 or more population showed an increase from about 64,000 in 1940 to 74,000 in 1942, an increase of about 16 per cent.²³ Unofficial statistics showed an increase of from 9 to 15 per cent in Chicago, New York, Washington, D. C., and Los Angeles in 1942 as compared with 1941, and 11 per cent in Connecticut.²⁴

The number of cases brought to the juvenile courts continued to increase. In 1944 the number of such cases for the whole country had increased to 118,626 (95,827 boys and 22,799 girls), of which 105,105 (84,951 boys and 20,154 girls) were in areas with populations of 100,000 or more. The corresponding figures for 1945 were respectively 122,851 (101,240 boys and 21,611 girls) and 108,469 (89,322 boys and 19,147 girls). Because of variations in the administrative practices of the juvenile courts, the Children's Bureau in reporting these statistics warned that they did not provide a reliable index of delinquency in each community or a basis for comparison between one community and another.

The types of delinquency for which juveniles (under ten to over sixteen years of age) were referred to the courts both in 1944 and in 1945 were stealing, acts of carelessness or mischief, traffic violations, truancy, running away, being ungovernable,

22. *School and Society*, January 15, 1944, p. 38.

23. *Controlling Juvenile Delinquency*, U. S. Children's Bureau, Publication 301, 1943, p. 2.

24. *Education for Victory*, March 15, 1943, p. 25.

sex offenses, injury to person, and other reasons. The majority of the boys appeared before the courts for stealing and acts of mischief, the majority of the girls for running away, being ungovernable, and sex offenses. More than half of the cases involved boys and girls over fourteen years of age. The sources of reference included police (in the great majority of the cases), school departments, probation officers, other courts, social agencies, parents or relatives, other individuals and sources.²⁵

It must be noted that the statistics reported by the Children's Bureau include only cases actually referred to the courts. That there was a progressive increase in juvenile delinquency is borne out by the statistics, but whether the situation was as alarming as newspapers reported cannot be established. The situation was probably described more accurately by the Children's Bureau in the following statement:

Whatever the exact figures of the extent of juvenile delinquency, we know that every year thousands of American youngsters "get into trouble." We cannot say with certainty whether juvenile delinquency is increasing or decreasing throughout the country as a whole because of the absence of reliable and comprehensive data over a period of years. Such statistics as are available have shown no alarming tendency to increased "juvenile crime," as newspapers perennially claim.

There is indication, however, that the war is bringing about increased concern regarding juvenile offenders. Newspaper reports from scattered localities draw attention to delinquency, especially among girls. They say: "The number of young girls on the streets, in the parks, and on bridges with soldiers late at night is increasing alarmingly;" or "an increased number of boys are running away from home . . ." All that the available figures indicate, however, is that in some communities juvenile delinquency has increased and generally the rate of increase is greater for girls than for boys.

Our Nation may face the prospect of a rich harvest of juvenile misconduct if we fail to take care of our children.²⁶

In view of the conditions that were potential factors in contributing to juvenile delinquency, it is surprising that the situa-

25. See *Juvenile-Court Statistics, 1944 and 1945*, supplement to *The Child*, U. S. Children's Bureau, November, 1946.

26. *Understanding Juvenile Delinquency*, U. S. Children's Bureau, Publication 300, 1943, p. 6.

tion was not worse than the available statistics actually revealed. The conditions were described by the Children's Bureau as follows:

Fathers are separated from their families because they are serving in the armed forces or working in distant war industries.

Mothers in large numbers are engaged in full-time employment and are therefore away from home most of the day.

Lack of consistent guidance and supervision from their parents give children opportunity for activities that may lead to unacceptable behavior.

An increasing number of children are now employed, in many instances under unwholesome conditions that impede their growth, limit their educational progress, or expose them to moral hazards.

The widespread migration of families to crowded centers of war industry has uprooted children from familiar surroundings and subjected them to life in communities where resources are overtaxed by the increased population.

Dance halls, beer parlors, and other "attractions" that flourish in industrial centers and near military establishments, unless kept under community control, frequently exert a harmful influence on youth.

The general spirit of excitement and adventure aroused by war and tension, anxiety, and apprehension felt by parents or other adults are reflected in restlessness, defiance, emotional disturbance, and other negative forms of behavior on the part of children and young people.²⁷

To these contributory causes may be added the general disturbance of school routine, the increasing shortage of teachers and the employment of teachers with substandard qualifications, and the early difficulties in providing school facilities, combined with inadequate housing facilities, in the industrial "boom towns."

Whether the newspaper reports on the increase of juvenile delinquency were accurate or not, they did perform an important service in directing attention to the serious need of preventive measures to meet the needs of children and youth. The federal program for the care of young children of working mothers and of children of school age both before and after school hours has been dealt with earlier. There was obvious need for increased

27. *Controlling Juvenile Delinquency*, U. S. Children's Bureau, Publication 301, 1943, pp. 1 f.

facilities for recreation, for the provision of school lunches, and for other supervisory activities. In-service courses were organized for teachers, supervisors, and administrators in order to promote a better understanding of maladjusted children. Efforts were made through the schools to redirect the energies of children and youth to constructive ends by a variety of activities which provided opportunities for working together for common purposes in such war-related activities as gardening, scrap and stamp drives, preinduction training, and pre-aviation and nurse training courses, which were included in the program of the High School Victory Corps (see pages 90-93). All activities of this type were designed to engage youth in services which they themselves would recognize as an integral part of the war program.

At its meeting in Indianapolis, June 27-29, 1943, the Representative Assembly of the National Education Association passed the following resolution on the subject of juvenile delinquency:

The National Education Association urges that the schools, in cooperation with other agencies, develop a constructive program to counteract these forces which are contributing to juvenile delinquency. To assist in making this program effective the Association strongly recommends:

- a. The adequate enforcement of all laws designed to protect the interests of youth, and
- b. The guidance necessary to enable youth to serve their country in the capacities for which they are best qualified.²⁸

Juvenile delinquency, however, whether in war years or in times of peace, is not primarily a school problem; it is rather a symptom of prevalent social conditions. Most of the forces that contribute to these maladjustments which in most cases lead to juvenile delinquency had in fact been discussed at the White House Conference on Children in a Democracy, which was held in January, 1940.²⁹ Cooperation between all social agencies, which is always essential, became more urgent during the war.

28. *Education for Victory*, July 15, 1943, p. 6.

29. See *White House Conference on Children in a Democracy*, U. S. Children's Bureau, Publication 272, Washington, D. C., 1940.

The importance of such cooperation was strongly emphasized by the U. S. Office of Education in the following statement:

The schools cannot stand alone, with a program isolated from those of other community agencies. There are clear indications of a growing realization of this fact. Over and over again the reports that have come from school administrators point to cooperative endeavor on the part of several community agencies, including the schools, in their attack upon juvenile delinquency. A number of projects already mentioned in preceding pages could not have been carried on except through a joint enterprise of this kind. Local defense councils, child-care committees, churches, recreation departments, social agencies, service clubs, parent-teachers groups, juvenile courts, coordinating councils, youth and youth-service organizations, industry and labor groups are among the many types of agencies which are joining hands with the schools in these precarious days.³⁰

The importance of cooperation between schools and social agencies was stressed by Katharine F. Lenroot, chief of the Children's Bureau. She advocated the extension of school services, keeping youth in school, provision of good housing, adequate enforcement of school attendance and child labor laws, development and strengthening of guidance and counseling services, provision of wholesome recreation, control of harmful influences within a community, and strengthening services "for the child showing a behavior problem, for he is the most vulnerable of all." An ounce of prevention is worth more than a pound of care:

The majority of children in trouble might not have gotten into serious difficulty if social services had been available early. For those who come to the attention of police and to the juvenile court, special services must be given. Further provision should be made for institutional and foster family care—in few communities is it adequate. Child-guidance services should be strengthened or, when not available, they should be established. They can play an important part in preventing further trouble.³¹

30. *Juvenile Delinquency and the Schools in Wartime*, School Children and the War Series, Leaflet No. 8. U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C., 1943, p. 18.

31. *Education for Victory*, August 21, 1944, pp. 1 f.

Youth, however, during the war as during the depression years³² presented the best explanation of their needs. Referring to the development of "youth centers" under the sponsorship of the Recreation Division of the Office of Community War Services, teen-agers indicated the needs which they met in the following statements:

There aren't any places to go to chew the fat. We've got things to talk about, even if we are kids. We like to be together. If you sit around in the drug stores, they shove you out. Stand on the street corners and the cop comes along and tells you to move on.

The sidewalk in front of the movie is the only youth center in our town. Sure, you can go to the show but there's no chance for visiting there. Shows cost money and so do bowling alleys and other places that are open to us. A youth center is a place where you can have fun the way you want it.

We have fun at school, too, but school is our job, and we like to go somewhere else to have fun. It's just like a business man who wants to get away from his office to play golf, or the woman who's been home all day and wants to go in the evening—part of the time at least. You can't paint pictures and slogans on the walls of a school. That's what makes the center our own.³³

While youth centers, "canteens for teens," "teen taverns," or "teen-age night clubs" were not the whole answer to the problem of juvenile delinquency, their development did throw light on one aspect of the problem—the need of providing carefully planned and supervised centers for recreation where young people can meet and organize their own activities. For the rest, "only as all citizens develop a sense of civic responsibility and participate with others for the common good can we hope to achieve the kind of community life in which delinquency will have small chance to flourish."³⁴

32. See H. M. Bell, *Youth Tell Their Story*, American Youth Commission, Washington, D. C., 1938.

33. *Youth Centers*, Division of Recreation, Office of Community War Services, Washington, D. C., 1945, p. 1.

34. *Understanding Juvenile Delinquency*, U. S. Children's Bureau, Publication 300, 1940, p. 52.

EXODUS OF TEACHERS

Of all the weaknesses in the American education system revealed by the war none was more serious than the unsatisfactory and unstable character of the teaching profession. The American public has always professed a strong faith in education and has provided generously for its provision and maintenance. The country from one end to the other has been filled with a network of schools and institutions for higher education, which have provided educational opportunities for its children and youth without parallel in any other country in the world. Even though the ideal of equalizing educational opportunities has not been attained as completely as might be desired, it has always been kept before the attention of the public. The one factor, however, perhaps the most important factor, that gives meaning to education—the teacher, was revealed by the war to have been neglected. The gravest problem in education during the war was the exodus of teachers from the schools and the consequent shortage of teachers.

That a shortage of teachers would occur was anticipated soon after Pearl Harbor. A study made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the service agency of the Office of Production Management, indicated possible shortages of high school teachers which might "impair the effective operation of secondary schools." As quoted in a memorandum issued on January 1, 1942 by General Lewis B. Hershey, director of the Selective Service System, and transmitted by Dr. Studebaker, U. S. Commissioner of Education, to chief state school officers, the results of this study anticipated that the major shortages were to be expected in vocational education, industrial arts, vocational agriculture, and physical education for men, fields in which teaching positions were filled by men who could not be replaced. Lesser shortages were expected in the teaching of physical science and mathematics; but even here, where the teaching could be done by women, the reserves of women teachers were being rapidly depleted. Referring to the Selective Service draft, General Hershey made the following statement:

In determining in each individual case the classification of teachers, it should be realized induction would not necessarily create vacancies as replacements may be available. However, where quali-

fied replacements are not available, an impairment of the level of education will result. This is more likely to be true in less prosperous communities where compensation and conditions are less attractive. The obligation of an individual for training and service should be carefully weighed against the national interest involved in the maintenance of the level of secondary education.³⁵

The shortages began to accumulate not only in the subject-matter fields which were anticipated but also in rural and other areas where salaries were far below those paid in war industries.³⁶ Efforts to meet the situation were made by employing women teachers who had left the profession to be married, by engaging substitutes and less experienced teachers, by lowering standards and granting emergency certificates, by increasing the load of teachers who remained in their positions, and by dropping certain courses. Salary increases or bonuses, without bringing salaries up to the cost of living, were granted to retain teachers, but this method was not widely adopted. A serious factor in the situation was the fall in enrollments in institutions for the preparation of teachers in the three years preceding the war. It was quite clear that the chief cause of the shortages was the attraction of better pay in war-related activities; the shortages were most marked at first in those states which had the largest rural areas. Although there were surpluses of teachers of certain high school subjects (English, social studies, and foreign languages), efforts to facilitate the flow of teachers failed even after a national teacher placement service was established and the cooperation of the U. S. Employment Service was secured.

The methods employed by state, county, and city school officers, according to a report prepared by the Committee on Teacher Supply and Demand of the Wartime Commission, included the following:

Survey and publicize conditions of teacher supply and demand.

Canvas, register, and retrain former teachers, and potential teachers not now in preparation.

Encourage more students to enter teaching.

Accelerate progress of prospective teachers through college.

35. *Education for Victory*, March 3, 1942, p. 29.

36. See Willard E. Givens, "It Should Not Happen Again," *Higher Education and the War*, American Council on Education Studies, Washington, D. C., 1942, pp. 84 ff.

Guide students in their choice of majors, minors, and courses from fields in which surpluses of teachers exist, to shortage fields.

Liberalize teacher-certificate requirements and practices.

Extend, improve, and coordinate the services of public teacher-placement and registration offices.

Liberalize teacher-employment practices, extend search for candidates to additional sources of supply.

Administer teacher personnel to secure maximum economy in utilizing and conserving teaching services; liberalize tenure and requirement practices.

Increase salaries and improve working conditions in teaching.

Keep local selective service boards fully informed concerning the employment situation with respect to men teachers of critical occupations and activities essential in prosecuting the war; when teachers are replaced, consider men not likely to be inducted; and restore inducted men to their positions when they return from service.³⁷

None of these methods was effective to stem the tide; teachers who left the profession were in the main replaced by inexperienced young people who were granted emergency certificates. By the middle of 1943 it was realized that the teacher shortage was a threat to the generation then in school. It was expected that it would take ten years to make up the deficiency of teachers created not only by the numbers who had left the profession, but also by the serious drop in the enrollments of teacher-education institutions. In a number of states campaigns were started to recruit prospective teachers. The State Department of Education of Michigan issued a pamphlet, *Should I Consider Teaching? Is It the Career For Me?* In the state of Washington a poster, *You Are Needed to Teach*, was widely distributed. Field agents were appointed to recruit candidates for the profession; special courses, intensive training, or refresher courses were instituted in some states. What was not given the attention that it deserved was the fact that the larger city school systems which paid adequate salaries and provided tenure and retirement schemes were not facing a serious shortage.

The educational situation was well summarized in the following excerpts from an editorial in the *American Federationist*, quoted in *Education for Victory*, September 15, 1943, p. 2:

37. *Ibid.*, July 1, 1942, pp. 11 f.

A democracy depends upon the education of its citizens. Education, of course, means something more than formal schooling, but schooling facilitates education. The rapid drop in high-school attendance is therefore of grave concern to the whole nation.

While teachers have been leaving the schools, young students have also been lured from their desks by the war-made opportunity to obtain lucrative employment. Emotional patriotic appeals in which the manpower shortage is cited often serve as a cloak for exploitation of the young.

The best development of children requires that they have opportunities for education and healthful recreation during their formative years. Only as a last resort in an extreme labor shortage should we deny them these rightful privileges of youth.

Not only should we enforce school attendance requirements, but we should make sure our school curriculum is properly organized to prepare boys and girls for the responsibilities of post-war living. Our children will live in a civilization in which the most distant parts of the earth are only hours away and in which all nations will be neighbors. Future peace and welfare depend upon our ability to live together, with respect for one another's differences, a respect founded on a real knowledge of the history and literature of our neighbors.

If the break-down in our educational opportunities interferes with our preparation for these new responsibilities, it will be the most fateful consequence of the war.

According to a report issued by the U. S. Office of Education, there were 864,300 teaching positions in the elementary and secondary schools of the country in October, 1942. During or at the close of the school year ending June, 1943, of these positions 192,500 became vacant, had to be filled, left vacant or abandoned before the school year opened in September or October, 1943. About 37,600 teachers who had left returned, presumably to better jobs. Of the remaining 154,900 positions, 132,100 were filled by persons who had not taught in the previous year (recent graduates or former teachers), while 15,100 positions were abandoned entirely for 1943-44 and 7,700 remained unfilled on October 1, 1943. Of the 132,100 new teachers about 56,900 had substandard training and were employed on emergency certificates good for one year.³⁸

38. *Education for Victory*, January 20, 1944, p. 8.

At the end of the war it was estimated that more than a third (350,000) of the competent teachers employed in 1940-41 had left teaching, the majority to accept higher paying positions in business, industry, and government services. According to estimates of the U. S. Office of Education, 109,000 teachers were employed on emergency certificates in 1945-46. Approximately 50 per cent of the teachers in elementary and secondary schools in 1945-46 were receiving less than \$2,000 a year; nearly 16 per cent or 136,000 were paid less than \$1,200 a year; and 2.4 per cent or about 21,000 received less than \$600 a year.³⁹ Nor were the prospects of an improvement in the situation brighter in 1946-47, for, although enrollments in teachers colleges began to increase, the majority of the students were returned veterans, unable to secure admission to liberal arts colleges and universities, who did not plan to enter the teaching profession. Whether the widespread campaigns, including teacher strikes, for the improvement of the economic status of teachers and the consequent increases in salary in 1946-47 would result in attracting more men and women into the teaching profession could not be anticipated in 1947. While the increases bring salaries approximately to the increased level in the cost of living, they were still regarded as inadequate for the purpose of recruiting able candidates. At the same time it began to be realized that low salaries were not the only reason which made teaching unattractive and that other factors, such as tenure, retirement provisions, the character of administration, prospects of promotion, and ultimate salaries attainable, enter into the consideration of young persons choosing a career.

If any lesson is to be learned from the war years, it is that the public as well as leaders in education have not paid sufficient attention in the past to the status of teachers. Since positions are evaluated by the economic rewards which they offer, teachers and the teaching profession have not enjoyed the prestige commensurate with the faith of the American public in education. The American public—and the responsibility rests with administrators of education—has not been made to realize that expenditure on buildings, however imposing they may be, is not a

39. National Education Association, "The Continuing Crisis in Education" (mimeographed report).

sufficient guarantee of good education. There is, of course, another reason to explain low salaries, the inadequate provision of equality of educational opportunities, and the wide variations of educational standards. That reason is the uneven distribution of wealth through the country, which during World War II, as during World War I, has emphasized the need of federal aid for education.

FEDERAL AID FOR EDUCATION

The defects of American education revealed by the war had been well known to the leaders in the field. That they were objectively proved in the greatest crisis in its history through which the country was passing directed the attention of the public to the fact that, however they may be administered, whether by the state or by local authorities, the quality and standards of education are the concern of the nation as a whole. Americans are a mobile people and the fact that the industrial areas, where the birth rate is declining, must draw their man power from the more backward areas, where the birth rate is high, has emphasized the importance of cooperation at all levels of the nation's administrative organization—federal, state, and local—in order to secure a reasonable standard of education in all parts of the country. To this was added a legitimate demand that access to educational opportunities should not be dependent upon the accident of residence. The depression years had already shown that without federal aid many communities were unable to maintain schools at all or for only a few months in the year, and that many young persons were unable for economic reasons to continue their studies in school or college. Federal funds alone made possible the continued operation of the educational system.⁴⁰

The situation almost on the eve of the outbreak of World War II was described in the following statement in a summary of findings and proposals by the Advisory Committee on Education, which had been appointed by President Roosevelt in 1936 to make a study of the experience under the program of federal aid for vocational education then in existence:

The public school system in the United States greatly needs im-

40. See *Federal Activities in Education*, Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association, Washington, D. C., 1939.

provement. Glaring inequalities characterize educational opportunities throughout the Nation. The education that can be provided at present in many localities is below the minimum necessary to preserve democratic institutions. Federal aid is the only way in which the difficulties in this widespread and complex situation can be adequately corrected.⁴¹

The inequalities affected every aspect of education: the amount of money spent per pupil in average attendance; the length of school year; the number of pupils of the appropriate age in high school; the value of school property; expenditures on equipment and instructional materials; the provision of health and welfare services; the cost per classroom unit; and teachers' salaries. Not only were there variations between states but variations existed within each state on each of these items of expenditure. The inequalities were particularly marked in the low-income states and in rural areas, where the largest number of children and youth had to be educated. The situation, as already stated earlier, was known before the war; it was brought home in a much more spectacular way when it could be pointed out that the number of men rejected for mental and physical deficiencies was the equivalent of several battalions of soldiers.

During the war years, however, action could be taken only to meet the immediate demands created by the rise of new defense areas ("boom towns") and to provide vocational training for war industries. During the fiscal year ended June 30, 1942, the funds provided by the Federal Government for education amounted to a total of \$286,401,164.35, distributed as follows:

Regular funds:

More complete endowment and support of land-grant colleges		\$ 5,030,000.00
Agricultural experiment stations		6,926,207.08
Cooperative agricultural extension service		18,956,918.06
Vocational education below college grade.....		21,768,122.03
Vocational rehabilitation		3,030,000.00
Total		\$ 55,711,247.17

41. *The Federal Government and Education*. Washington, D. C., 1938, p. 1.

Emergency funds:

College and high school student aid (NYA)	\$ 16,180,391.55
School building (WPA)	25,846,520.00
Education program (WPA)	18,785,939.00
Defense training in colleges	15,878,189.42
Defense training in secondary schools	99,704,280.21
Educational facilities for war work areas	54,294,597.00
<hr/>	
Total	\$230,689,917.18

The emergency funds included grants made during the depression years, which were shortly discontinued. In 1941 the 77th Congress appropriated (Public Law 146) \$116,122,000 to the U. S. Office of Education to provide training and education for national defense workers, to be distributed as follows: \$52,400,000 for vocational courses of less than college grade conducted under plans approved by the U. S. Commissioner of Education; \$20,000,000 for the purchase of equipment to carry on defense training courses; \$17,500,000 for short courses of college grade to meet the shortage of engineers, chemists, etc.; \$15,000,000 for vocational courses of less than college grade for out-of-school youth over 17; \$10,000,000 for vocational courses for young people on work projects of the National Youth Administration; \$1,222,000 for general administrative expenses.

To meet the unexpected needs of the increased populations in defense areas the same Congress appropriated, under the Lanham Act (Public Law 137), \$150,000,000 for public works necessary to carry on community life substantially expanded by the national defense program, including schools. In January, 1942, an additional appropriation of \$150,000,000 was authorized (Public Law 409).

For purposes of comparison with the figures given in the preceding table the allotments of Federal Government funds for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1945, are given in the following table:⁴²

42. Based on *Federal Government Funds for 1944-45 and 1945-46*, U. S. Office of Education, Leaflet No. 77, Washington, D. C., 1946.

Regular funds:

More complete endowment and support of land-grant colleges		\$ 5,030,000.00
Agricultural experiment stations		7,001,207.08
Cooperative agricultural extension		22,996,840.06
Vocational education below college grade		21,768,122.03
Vocational rehabilitation		11,672,112.27
Total		\$ 68,468,281.44

Emergency funds:

Vocational defense training in secondary schools		\$ 48,770,467.40
Food production, war training, in secondary schools		1,587,923.63
Defense training in colleges		6,878,078.00
Educational facilities for war work areas		13,812,029.00
School lunches		47,844,050.00
Total		\$ 118,892,548.03
Grand total		\$ 187,360,829.47

This sum does not include the allotments for extended school services (child care) under the Lanham Act, October 14, 1940, and amendments, which amount to a total from their initiation to February 28, 1946, of \$52,750,672.

The data on the existing inequalities in education throughout the country, accumulated during the depression and war years, helped to intensify the efforts of the advocates of federal aid for education. Bills were introduced in Congress to provide federal aid and, although they failed of enactment, the resistance to such a measure was gradually diminished. At its meeting in December, 1944, the National Council of Chief State Officers reiterated its stand on federal aid and issued the following statement:

The National Council of Chief State School Officers reiterates its previous stand for S. 637 and H. R. 2849 and announces its unalterable determination to press with renewed vigor for the enactment of this proposed legislation which would provide Federal financial aid to the public schools of the Nation with adequate safeguards to preserve the local control, supervision, and administration of public education.

The Council holds that that nation which does have, should have,

and must have the right to reach into the most poverty stricken home in the remotest part of the poorest State in this Union and draft the young manhood of that home to face the battle line for the protection of democratic ideals and institutions must find some way to dedicate a reasonable portion of its resources in order that every child in every home throughout the land may have a reasonable opportunity to develop his intelligence, his skill, his talents, his ideals, and his attitudes in such way as to make him fit to serve a democracy in time of peace.⁴³

In March, 1945, the Problems and Policies Commission of the American Council on Education and the Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association issued a pamphlet on *Federal-State Relation in Education* (Washington, D. C.) which not only gave a résumé of the known facts on the inequalities in education, but, profiting from the experience during the war, emphasized the importance of a clear pattern to govern the cooperation of federal, state, and local authorities in education. In place of the great variety of federal appropriations for special aspects of education, whether under regular or emergency provisions, the report recommended general grants in order to enable the states to provide a national minimum of financial support for education. It was also recommended that federal funds be distributed on an objective basis such as the number of children and youth to be educated and the financial ability of each state. In view of the large number of federal agencies concerned with education, it was suggested that the number of such agencies be reduced and better coordination be established between those that remained.

The movement for federal aid for education, which began during World War I, was intensified by the deficiencies revealed during World War II. Although the data on which arguments for such aid were based had been known for a long time, new studies were undertaken during World War II which reinterpreted existing data and strengthened the arguments in favor of federal participation in education as a national interest. In 1942 the National Education Association issued a pamphlet on *Federal Aid for Education: A Review of Pertinent Facts*. Further light was thrown on the situation in a study sponsored by the National

43. *Education for Victory*, January 3, 1944, p. 3.

Education Association and the American Council on Education and published in 1946 under the title *Unfinished Business in American Education: An Inventory of Public School Expenditures in the United States*, which was prepared by Professors John K. Norton and Eugene S. Lawler.

The study reviewed the extent of illiteracy as shown in the census of 1940 and in the number of rejections for educational, mental, and physical deficiencies. While large numbers of children were taught by poorly prepared and poorly paid teachers in one-room shacks with inadequate equipment and instructional materials, others were educated in spacious buildings and were taught by competent teachers with access to excellent equipment and instructional materials. The annual cost per classroom unit, which included salaries, books, equipment, and maintenance, showed a range from less than \$100 to \$6,000 in 1939-40. The median annual cost per classroom unit was \$1,600, but 1,401,605 children were in schools where the cost per classroom unit was \$4,000 a year and 1,175,996 were in schools with a unit cost of less than \$500 a year. The cost per unit was lowest in areas where the largest number of children had to be educated. Variations existed in the ratio of the number of children of school age per 1,000 of the population, in the per capita income for each child to be educated in the different states, and in the financial effort needed for the support of schools. States with the lowest expenditures for education devoted a larger percentage of their incomes to education than those with the highest expenditures. Where dual systems of schools were provided, the expenditure for the education of Negro children was nearly one-third of the expenditure for white children.

The inequalities existed not only in the states with low incomes but in rural schools in general. The problem of education in rural areas could not be isolated from the general problem of education throughout the nation, since the quality of education in rural areas ultimately affected the quality of citizenship in the urban areas, to which the rural population was migrating in increasing numbers. This special aspect of American education was the subject of discussion at the White House Conference on Rural Education, when "A Charter of Education for Rural Children" was drafted. It was the consensus of opinion at the

Conference that rural children should be provided with all the services needed for a modern education (adequate opportunities for elementary and secondary education; better prepared teachers, supervisors, and administrators; library facilities; health services and recreational activities; school lunches and transportation facilities; vocational guidance; and greater cooperation between the school and community life). To guarantee these provisions, however, demanded the use of the tax resources of the local community, the state, and the nation.⁴⁴ Rural schools were more seriously affected by the war conditions than urban schools. Teachers left the rural schools in larger numbers; and, where pupils had to be transported to schools, difficulties arose because bus drivers entered the armed forces or war industries and because tires and gas were rationed.

An important contribution to the whole problem was made by a report on *Education—an Investment in People*, issued by the Committee on Education of the United States Chamber of Commerce in 1945. The report reviewed all the available data on the existing inequalities in the provision of education throughout the country and on the educational deficiencies discovered by the Selective Service System. Pointing the report to emphasize the relation between the volume of economic activity and the various states and the level of educational expenditure, the Committee showed that there was a direct correlation between current expense for education, median years of education completed, and the rate of educational deficiencies revealed by the Selective Service System on the one hand, and the per capita sales in 1940, rent paid for homes, the number of telephones per 1,000 of population, and the circulation of national magazines on the other.

On the basis of its enquiry the Committee reached the following conclusions:

That education is an essential investment for the advance of agriculture, industry, and commerce.

That every community should ascertain its own education status and economic condition and set to work to utilize education as a lever for its own advancement.

44. See *The White House Conference on Rural Education*, Washington, D. C., 1944.

That the cost of adequate education is an investment which local citizens and business can well afford in increased measure.

That education programs must be made to apply more directly to the needs of the people.

That cultural education must accompany technical training to develop the desire for better living.

That to maintain a representative republic, business must discover sound methods for the expansion of our dynamic economy.

Education, as an essential instrument in that expansion, is a challenge to American business. Business must determine if its sponsorship of expanded education as a means of economic improvement will answer the maximum demands for a fuller participation in the larger life that the American scene promises in the postwar era.⁴⁵

Although the Committee made no pronouncement in favor of or against federal aid, the data contained in its report brought the whole problem of the national interest in the adequate provision of education to the attention of a larger public than was normally reached by the publications of professional educators. Whether intended or not, this and other reports were probably effective in the organization of a bipartisan committee in Congress (Committee for the Support of Federal Aid for Public Schools) in November, 1945. In his Annual Message to Congress on January 21, 1946, President Truman proposed "that the Federal Government provide financial aid to assist the states in assuring more nearly equal opportunities for a good education." He concluded his message on this subject with the statement that "The Federal Government has not sought, and will not seek, to dominate education in the states. It should continue its historic role of leadership and advice and, for the purpose of equalizing opportunities, it should extend further financial support to the cause of education in areas where this is desirable."

It is to be noted that fear of federal domination of education in the states had been countered in recent bills to provide federal aid by definite provisions prohibiting the exercise of any direction, supervision, or control over or prescription of any requirements with respect to any school or any state educational institution or agency to which funds would be made available. Such

45. *Education—an Investment in People*, United States Chamber of Commerce, Committee on Education, Washington, D. C. [1945], p. 3.

provisions were needed and salutary, since, although the federal appropriations for education, whether under regular or emergency legislation, had in fact encouraged the development of specific types of education, chiefly vocational, at the expense of other types. Properly interpreted, these provisions should lead to general or block grants for the all-round improvement of the quality and standards of education.

The extent of the educational needs of the country was indicated in the proposals for a postwar program of education, published in 1943 by the National Resources Planning Board. The program was to include education for health and safety; vocational training; education for leisure, home and family living, national security and citizenship; social and economic education; and provision for the education of veterans and others whose education had been interrupted by the war. The Board estimated that the cost of the program would be \$6,100,000,000, distributed as follows:

Preschool, elementary and secondary schools	\$3,000,000,000
Junior colleges	400,000,000
Colleges, universities, professional and technical institutions	1,000,000,000
Adult education	300,000,000
Student aid	300,000,000
Public libraries	200,000,000
Improvement of buildings	2,380,000,000

The total cost of the proposed program would be slightly more than twice as much as the total amount—\$2,817,000,000—spent on education by all public agencies in 1940. The same estimate of the cost of providing an educational system appropriate to the needs of the country was reached in a statement in *Our Children*, Annual Report of the Profession to the Public by the Executive Secretary of the National Education Association, Washington, D. C., 1946:

The welfare of our children and the internal security of our nation, to both of which education is fundamental, are matters of great importance to us. We should be willing to pay for them.

Our national income is evidence of our ability to pay for education. In 1929 the national income was 83 billion dollars. We spent 2.7 per cent of that sum to maintain the public schools. When, in

the depression year of 1932, the national income dropped to 40 billion dollars, school expenditures were a little more than 5 per cent of the total national earnings. When the war year 1943 brought a national income of 149 billion dollars, the proportion used for school support was 1.5 per cent. We have never had a national policy governing our outlay for education.

Estimates of the national income of the United States for the postwar years range from 120 billion dollars upward. It is unlikely that a minimum defensible educational program for our children can be supported at any less than 5 per cent of the postwar national earnings. This per cent of the national income would be no higher than that made available to schools in the depression year of 1932. It would provide a better system of education than this country has ever known. It would entail a much smaller sacrifice on the part of the taxpayer than was involved in providing 5 per cent of the national income of 40 billion dollars for the starved schools of 1933. . . . We can afford to educate our children (pp. 15 f.).

Nothing stands out more clearly from these discussions and the data accumulated to support them than the fact that many children and youth of the country are educationally disfranchised both by accident of residence and by economic circumstances of their parents. The war focussed attention on education as a national concern and on the need of a clear-cut policy. Out of the debates which have continued since World War I there has slowly been evolved the principle that the adequate provision of education demands the cooperation of local, state, and federal governments. As recent bills for federal aid have shown, there need be no fear lest federal aid would mean federal control. There is, however, one aspect of the problem which has not received the attention that it deserves, and that is that increase in the amount of education provided is not necessarily a guarantee of its quality.

In general, the issue for the country as a whole was clearly stated in 1940 in a broadcast by President Roosevelt on the occasion of the White House Conference, held in Washington, D. C., January 18-20, on "Children in a Democracy," when he said:

All Americans want this country to be a place where children can live in safety and grow in understanding of the part they play in the Nation's future.

I believe with you that if anywhere in the country a child lacks opportunity for home life, for health protection, for education, for moral and spiritual development, the strength of the Nation and its ability to cherish and advance the principles of democracy are thereby weakened.⁴⁶

In an address to the members of the Conference, Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt presented a broad statement on the meaning of educational opportunity for and in a democracy:

Democracy is being challenged to-day, and we are the greatest democracy. It remains to be seen if we have the vision and the courage and the self-sacrifice to really give our children a chance all over the nation to be really citizens of a democracy. If we are going to do that we must see that they get a chance at health, that they get a chance at an equal opportunity for education. We must see that they get a chance at the kind of education which will help them to meet a changing world. We must see that as far as possible these youngsters when they leave school get a chance to work and get a chance to be taken in and feel important as members of their communities. . . .

I hope that from this Conference there will come a knowledge throughout the country of the needs of young people and willingness to take a national point of view and a national sense of responsibility for the young people of the nation who will some day make the Nation.⁴⁷

46. *School Life*, March, 1940, p. 181.

47. *Ibid.*, p. 182.

SECONDARY EDUCATION FOR ALL

ADJUSTING THE HIGH SCHOOLS TO THE WAR EFFORT

THE HIGH SCHOOLS were faced with more serious difficulties during the war than either the elementary schools or the colleges. The majority of the college students were near or at the age limits of Selective Service and were certain to be inducted into the armed forces; it was for them to make the most of the brief opportunity for education that they might have before being called up. The high school population consisted of an age group of which the older boys would almost certainly be called up, while the younger boys might be, depending on the length of the war. Another cause of unrest and uncertainty arose almost immediately after the country entered the war as a result of the demand for man power in the war industries. It was difficult for the four-fifths of the students—boys and girls—who did not plan to go on to college to continue with the regular routine of their studies when they were able-bodied and ready, from patriotic motives or the attraction of high wages, to take up some activity that would contribute to the war effort. Education could not be conducted as usual, nor did there appear to many to be any sense in pursuing academic studies which seemed to be remote from the immediate needs of the day. There was still another cause of unrest; the raising of the requirements of compulsory attendance in the years between the two wars kept in the high schools a large number of students who saw no reason or purpose in continuing their education, and who were restrained from leaving school only by child labor laws.

To these factors which made for unrest may be added another; the pattern of secondary education was not so clearly established as to have produced a definite and generally accepted philosophy. The uncertainty about secondary education had begun in 1890 and became more aggravated as enrollments in-

creased at such a rate that they had doubled every ten years between 1890 and 1940. Committees of inquiry followed each other in rapid succession, and in the decade preceding the war the problems of secondary education and of youth were the subjects of reports by a National Survey of Secondary Education and the American Youth Commission, appointed by the American Council on Education in 1935 to consider the needs and problems of youth and to suggest methods and resources to meet them. In 1940 a subcommittee of the latter issued a brief report on *What the High Schools Ought to Teach*, which was followed four years later by a report of the Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association on *Education for All American Youth*. The general trend of these reports was to place an emphasis on practical and vocational education, the development of which had been stimulated since 1917 by the provision of federal aid under the provisions of the Smith-Hughes Act and the George Deen Act.

There had thus developed a conflict at the secondary level between academic and vocational education. The urgent demands of the war for increased production, industrial and agricultural, and the unrest of youth threw the balance in favor of vocational education. Statistics are not available, but there was enough evidence during the war not only that enrollments in academic subjects declined but that teachers of academic subjects, who could not be dismissed under tenure regulations, were assigned to teach subjects for which a new demand arose and in which the teachers were themselves not prepared.¹ The trend toward the provision of instruction that appeared to be more practical in character and more contributory to the war effort, as well as to the maintenance of student morale, was hastened by the war training program of the U. S. Office of Education and the introduction of preinduction courses encouraged by the armed forces.

The keynotes for education during the war were sounded by Paul V. McNutt and John W. Studebaker in the first issue of *Education for Victory*, March 3, 1942. In the statements which are quoted in full on p. 24, the former stressed the fact that "You're in the Army now" and the latter emphasized teamwork

1. See I. L. Kandel, "Interchangeable Parts in Education," *School and Society*, November 1, 1941, pp. 385 f.

and the urgency to speed sound educational programs for time to come.

At the fourth meeting of the U. S. Office Wartime Commission a report was presented by Carl A. Jessen, senior specialist in secondary education, U. S. Office of Education, in cooperation with representatives of secondary education and of the training divisions of the Army and Navy, on "The Best Kind of High School Training for Military Service." The question regarding the introduction of military drill in high schools, raised by many high school leaders, was answered by a report that the Army found it impossible to supply equipment or to detail officer personnel for this purpose, an answer which was "far from being a satisfactory answer to young and enthusiastic patriots who want to do their bit." The armed services were prepared to give the necessary drill after enlistment or induction. As pointed out earlier, they relied upon the schools for training in other respects equally important to military efficiency.

Because of deficiencies of many of those that come to them, the armed services, however, are constantly compelled to instruct recruits in areas and subjects in which the schools are entirely competent to supply the training. In the pages which follow an effort is made to indicate in broad outline the contribution which schools can make to preinduction training. The courses proposed are not a substitute for military training; they are military training in as real a sense as is military drill.

The Army and Navy emphasized "the need of competent, alert, loyal, brave, and healthy men who are able both to give orders and obey them." Hence health and physical education to produce "robust toughened bodies not required in ordinary civilian pursuits" assumed a position of paramount importance. Pupils should be given periodic health inspection to be followed up, where necessary, by medical and dental care, the correction of physical defects, and the provision of nutritious foods. Beyond this the schools could give instruction in certain skills and information useful in the armed forces and in civilian life. Three groups of activities were recommended for all students, both boys and girls: (1) Those important for survival under war conditions (air raid and fire drills with adequate instruction

about the protection of themselves and their homes, first aid, home hygiene, and life-saving instruction). (2) Activities and skills useful in the armed forces, particularly in physical education (hard-driving competitive sports and games involving physical contact, swimming, tumbling, boxing and wrestling, strenuous "setting-up" exercises, hiking and pitching camp, jumping and running, and skiing). (3) Areas of information useful in the armed forces, with changes of emphasis in the established high school courses as follows:

More of the English for use, especially practice in understanding directions, dispatches, and accounts, whether orally or in writing; in social studies why we are at war, the historical background and the current changes in the war situation, what we must do to win the war, and the moral obligation of each one to serve country and community; in mathematics a nearer approach to 100 per cent mastery of fundamentals; in science the elements of physics and chemistry—these are knowledges and informations which the Army and Navy especially desire that their personnel should have.

In addition to a thorough knowledge in the basic areas mentioned, each recruit should have specialized knowledge in one or more areas: international Morse Code; radio and telephone operation and repair, including transmission and receipt of messages; automobile and airplane maintenance and repair; machine shop work; factory work; photography; map reading; personal hygiene and nutrition; home nursing (especially for girls), the area to be selected on the advice of the guidance service set up by the school.²

This report served as the basis for the introduction of preinduction courses in the high schools of the country, the number and organization depending on the availability of equipment and teachers. The lack of an adequate supply of teachers was felt very early in the war in the fields of physics and mathematics. To meet the need the U. S. Office of Education announced on July 15, 1942, the provision of war courses for teachers of these subjects under the Engineering, Science, and Management War Training Program (ESMWT) which it was administering.

The importance of preinduction training was further empha-

2. See *Education for Victory*, April 15, 1942, pp. 3 f.

sized in the following letter, of January 15, 1943, to "The High School Educators of the Nation" from the Chief of Naval Personnel, Rear Admiral Randall Jacobs:

1. It is of first importance that young men (and young women) expecting to enter the various branches of the Naval Service should come well prepared to fit into the Navy's system of special skills in the shortest time possible. The Navy Department, therefore, appreciates this opportunity to tell you what types of educational programs are of most value toward this end.

2. In general, high schools should continue to improve instruction in such basic courses as physics, mathematics, the other sciences, and English. These subjects are fundamental to advanced instruction in the technical phases of naval activities and should not be supplanted by courses in aeronautics, radio, navigation, and other similar specialized subjects. The established training agencies of the Navy Department are well qualified to teach the advanced specialized courses.

3. There is no reason, however, why high-school students should not be brought more directly into contact with matters relating to their possible future activities in the U. S. Navy. This can be accomplished in two ways—by illustrating the general principles in the fields of science, mathematics, and other subjects with naval situations and by employing such courses and extra-curricular activities as are recommended for the High School Victory Corps. The Navy Department favors programs of technical or semitechnical instruction so long as they do not impair the basic educational preparation in the high school upon which the Navy expects to base its specialized training.³

The Navy had already begun to be concerned about deficiencies in mathematics among candidates for commissions. In reply to an inquiry addressed to him on October 30, 1941, by Louis I. Bredvold, member of the University of Michigan Advisory Committee on Military Affairs, Admiral Chester W. Nimitz gave the following facts and figures: In an examination for entrance to the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps, given to 4,200 freshmen at twenty-seven of the leading universities, 68 per cent of the candidates were unable to pass the arithmetic reasoning test; 62 per cent failed the whole test, which included also arithmetical

3. *Ibid.*, February 1, 1943.

combinations, vocabulary, and spatial relations. "The majority of failures were not merely borderline, but were far below passing grade." Only 10 per cent had already taken trigonometry in their high schools, and only 23 per cent had taken more than one and a half years of mathematics. The same lack of fundamental education was found in the selection and training of midshipmen for commissioning as ensigns, V-7. Of 8,000 applicants, all college graduates, some 3,000 had to be rejected because they had had no mathematics, or insufficient mathematics at college, while 40 per cent of the applicants had not taken plane trigonometry in the course of their education. In attempting to teach navigation in the Naval Officers' Training Corps Units and in the Naval Reserve Midshipmen Training Program (V-7) it was found that 75 per cent of the failures in the study of navigation were due to lack of adequate knowledge of mathematics, a subject also necessary in fire control and in many other vital branches of the naval officer's profession. In order to enroll the requisite number of men at one of the training stations it was found necessary to lower the standards in 50 per cent of the admissions. In the General Classification Test the lowest category of achievement was in arithmetic. On a geographical distribution it was found that proficiency in arithmetic in the eastern part of the country was strikingly greater than in the Middle West and West. "The lowest average mark East of the Mississippi was equal to the highest average mark West of the Mississippi. The three highest average attainments in arithmetic were achieved by the recruiting stations in Troy, Brooklyn, and Buffalo—all in New York State."⁴

It was no doubt as a consequence of this letter and the discussions that followed that the U. S. Office of Education, in cooperation with the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, appointed a committee, in December, 1942, "to make a survey of the mathematical needs of the armed forces and upon this basis to make a report concerning what the schools can do for the emergency." The report of this committee was published in *Education for Victory*, April 1, 1943. Similar action was taken

4. "The Importance of Mathematics in the War Effort," *The Mathematics Teacher*, February, 1942, pp. 88 f.

to furnish guidance in preinduction orientation to promote "understanding of the background of the war" and "understanding of the nature of military life." A report on these two areas of understanding was prepared by the National Council for Social Studies with the cooperation of the U. S. Office of Education and the Pre-Induction Training Branch, Military Division, Headquarters, Army Service Forces. The report, published in *Education for Victory*, December 15, 1943, discussed the need of a preinduction orientation program, the Army's postinduction orientation program, understanding the war (what is at stake, background of the Second World War, the United States and the Second World War, campaigns of the Second World War, understanding our allies and our enemies, resources of the United States, geography in world affairs), understanding the Army (our new Army, organization of the Army, Army training, special characteristics of the Army, suggested activities), entering the Army, Selective Service, induction, reception center, the soldier's pay and privileges, and typical problems of military group living. Reference materials were cited for students and teachers.

The issue of *Education for Victory*, November 15, 1943, dealt more specifically with material on "Guiding Youth for Army Service," prepared by the Occupational Information and Guidance Service, Vocational Division, U. S. Office of Education, and the Civilian Pre-Induction Training Branch, Industrial Personnel Division, Headquarters, Army Service Forces. The material presented details on army needs in wartime: the common needs of all soldiers; the Army's specialized needs (eligibility requirements for the Army Specialized Training Programs, for the Air Corps Enlisted Reserve Corps, and for voluntary induction into the Army Air Forces; range of jobs in the Army and the competencies needed; work of the various arms and services; factors which determine assignment and classification). A section on "What the Schools Can Do" contained the following suggestions:

To guide boys so that they are able to meet these specialized Army needs, schools can give both information and training.

In many schools information on Army specialized needs can be provided through classes in occupations, orientation courses, senior

class meetings, senior problems courses, homeroom discussions, and other similar group situations. English classes and social studies courses can also be vehicles for conveying this information.⁵

Schools were urged to give prospective recruits an "Educational Experience Summary Card," on which preinduction training could be recorded.

The schools were mobilized for the war effort not only to provide the necessary orientation for the future members of the Armed Forces but also to furnish vocational training to meet the growing demand for manpower in industry and agriculture. Under the direction of the U. S. Office of Education a program to meet the emergency defense training needs had been launched in June, 1940. The program was extended and intensified after Pearl Harbor, when it was adapted to meet war production training needs. Vocational schools were called upon to train not only high school students but also workers who were dislocated from nondefense industries and needed retraining to fit them for service in war-production industries. Classes were held at all hours of the day for all types of men and women. So far as high school students were concerned, the demand for admission to courses in vocational training was greater than the schools could accommodate. There was, in fact, a pronounced shift of interest from academic studies to vocational training. Even those studies, whose importance in preinduction training was generally emphasized, were seriously affected by the shortage of teachers of mathematics, physics, and physical education.

On June 28, 1940, Congress appropriated \$15,000,000 for the purpose of training persons for employment in occupations essential to national defense. By a succession of appropriating acts between 1940 and 1945 a total of \$326,900,000 was made available for the training of defense and war-production workers in trade and industrial occupations, and \$63,000,000 for training in agriculture through the rural and food production war training programs. In this period over 11,500,000 enrollments were reported in these exclusively war-connected training programs. The regular program of vocational education in the schools, under the Smith-Hughes and George Deen Acts, was adjusted

5. *Ibid.*, November 15, 1943, p. 12.

to meet the changing conditions. Vocational agricultural programs "were adjusted to provide for additional production of farm crops and to emphasize the care and maintenance of farm machinery," while teachers of vocational agriculture "organized and supervised programs of food conservation and preservation." In trade and industrial training programs younger students were enrolled as the older ones were drawn into the armed services. The home economics programs placed "greater emphasis on food conservation and home gardening, nutrition, child care, home care of the sick, conservation of clothing, home furnishings and home equipment, and cooperation with community agencies in the many problems of family and community life."⁶

The demand for man power and the attraction of high wages created a serious problem in the high schools of the country. That many high school students should enter wage-earning occupations during the school vacation was in the accepted tradition. Some concern was caused, however, lest the child-labor provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act (the Wage and Hour Law) of 1938 might be violated, and young employees be exploited at the expense of their health. Because of war conditions and the greatly increased opportunities, boys and girls accepted employment outside school hours while schools were in session. Attention was drawn by the Children's Bureau, U. S. Department of Labor, to the child labor regulations which prohibited the employment of young persons under sixteen in manufacturing establishments, and limited employment outside school hours, while schools were in session, to three hours a day, and, when schools were not in session, to eight hours a day and forty hours a week.⁷

EXODUS OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

The situation became progressively more serious during the war years. Many high school students who were employed during vacations did not return to school; many worked longer

6. See *Vocational Education in the Years Ahead, A Report to Study Postwar Problems in Vocational Education*, U. S. Office of Education, Vocational Division Bulletin No. 234, Washington, D. C., 1945, pp. 11 ff.

7. "Protect Classroom Interests of Teen-Agers," *Education for Victory*, November 20, 1944, p. 11.

hours than the law permitted while schools were in session. It became increasingly difficult to keep students in school; compulsory school attendance laws were violated and the requirement of work permits was ignored. The situation was met in the larger centers by the organization of "work-study" programs under which students attended school for part of the day and worked for part of the day. The normal program required four hours of school attendance and four hours of work each day, "the four-four plan." Arrangements were made to give credits for work experience, which counted toward graduation. The situation which had to be met was described as follows in a circular, "Importance of Completing One's Education," issued by the New York City superintendent of schools:

The number of vacation work permits issued to high school students has increased tenfold since the outbreak of the war. The number of permanent work permits has tripled. There is serious danger that many of the holders of these permits will be tempted by high wages to continue in their jobs rather than return to school. It is incumbent upon us as educators to do all in our power to persuade them that such a course would do them irreparable harm. . . .

When hostilities have ceased we shall probably have a larger number of college-trained people available for employment than at any other time in our history and it is not difficult to see how unfortunate will be the position of the young man or woman who has not even completed high school.⁸

The gravity of the situation had begun to be realized in 1943, when in a statement, "Back to School," issued by the U. S. Office of Education in cooperation with the Children's Bureau, U. S. Department of Labor, educators were informed that they held "a solemn responsibility to guide youth to right decisions." The number of work permits given to youth between fourteen and eighteen had shown a rapid increase. The right and obligation of every child to pursue an educational program were emphasized in the following arguments:

We must not permit this war to become a children's crusade. While it is recognized that children have responsibilities, corresponding to their age and maturity, for contributing to the general

8. *Ibid.*, February 3, 1944, pp. 1 ff.

welfare of the Nation, it needs also to be recognized that their responsibilities must not be determined solely on the basis of *immediacy*. Rather these should be decided largely on the assumption that *this Nation will survive the war and will have an honorable future*. This assumption calls for the education of all our children in order that they may be qualified to carry forward our democratic form of society in the future.

Their education and their contribution to present-day wartime needs, therefore, should be considered as *a total problem*, not two separate and independent problems. Also each child of working age constitutes an individual case for study and counseling. For many of these youth their greatest contribution to national welfare will be full-time school attendance; for some a combination of school and work, carefully planned to suit the needs of the individual, will constitute not only a desirable welfare contribution, but the best educational experience; and for still others full-time employment, in accordance with the individual's abilities, will offer a maximum opportunity both to earn and also to serve the country's welfare and, at the same time, to make adjustments for adult life.

It should be borne in mind by the general public, by parents of school children, and by pupils themselves that the present school program has been determined after years of development and experimentation in efforts to establish a minimum for educational opportunities deemed necessary to meet the requirements for citizenship in our democratic form of government. The completion of this program, including the level of secondary education, either by full-time school attendance or by a combination of school and work activities is important for both the child and school and work experience, uninterruptedly and free from distracting conditions, is both the right and obligation of every child.⁹

These exhortations were followed in the next year by Go-to-School Drives, in which the U. S. Office of Education, the Children's Bureau, the War Manpower Commission, and the Office of War Information cooperated. In an urgent request directed to youth under eighteen to continue their education the following facts were presented. Since 1940-41, when the high schools had the highest enrollments in their history, a sharp drop of 1,000,000 students had taken place. It was urged that the nation-

9. *Ibid.*, September 1, 1943, p. 2; see also "Back to School: A Statement by the Commissioner" (Dr. John L. Studebaker), *ibid.*, September 15, 1943, p. 1.

wide Go-to-School Drive be supported by the organization of local committees, which in turn would use the press, board of education's publications, principal's letters to students, cooperation with employers, school counseling, parent-teacher committees, and other devices to encourage youth to remain in school either part- or full-time.¹⁰ The drive was taken up seriously throughout the country, as reported in the following statement:

The "Go-to-School Drive" has captured the attention of the people of this country. Not since the height of the battle for the enactment of compulsory educational laws, a half century ago, has anything occasioned such a re-manifestation of the assumption of our founding fathers that an education is the rightful heritage of every child.¹¹

ACCELERATION

The enrollments in high schools dropped from 6,713,913 in 1940-41 to 5,553,520 in 1943-44, a drop which could not be wholly accounted for by the decline in the birth rate in the preceding years nor by the lowering of the draft age to eighteen, which had hardly had time to affect the enrollments. Nor could the adoption of a modified form of acceleration have exercised any serious influence. A scheme of acceleration was adopted in high schools in 1942 to enable competent students to enter colleges at an earlier age than they would normally have done. But the scheme was carefully restricted by a number of criteria. In the first place, acceleration had to be justified for the following reasons:

1. To take Engineering, Scientific and Management Defense Training work.
2. To save time in preparing for other equally important professional or semiprofessional services requiring degrees or other long courses of study.
3. To assist individuals to secure or advance as far as possible toward their college degrees before selection for or enlistment in the armed forces.

In identifying individual students for acceleration, it was urged that the following considerations be borne in mind:

10. *Ibid.*, August 3, 1944, pp. 1 ff.; September 4, 1944, pp. 1 f.

11. *Ibid.*, September 20, 1944, p. 1; see also October 3, 1944, pp. 13 f.; October 20, 1944, p. 2.

Is the individual—

1. Old enough chronologically to be legally employed after acceleration?²
2. Strong enough to work on the job or to attend school on a lengthened schedule?
3. Suitable with respect to personal characteristics, including maturity for objectives? (The term "objective" is to be interpreted as a college course, specific job training, or specific job, as the case may be.)
4. A quick enough learner to justify faster instructional methods?
5. Endowed mentally to the degree required for the specific objectives?
6. Able to arrange his personal needs, including finances, so as to devote more time per week or year to his educational program?
7. Specially apt, able, or skillful for specific objectives?
8. Planning to leave school anyway on his own initiative for work, VE-ND study, or enlistment?¹²

High school principals were advised to submit detailed reports about the qualifications of students for earlier entrance to college. It was recommended that such reports should include:

1. A description of the student, indicating qualities of character, habits of work, personality and social adjustment.
2. The results of the use of instruments of evaluation by the schools: (a) Such standardized tests as are applicable to the school's work. (b) Other types of tests appropriate to the objectives of the school. (c) Scholastic aptitude tests that measure characteristics essential to college work and are independent of particular patterns of school preparation.

The high school should state what the student is competent to do in college.¹³

At no time was it suggested that a policy of acceleration similar to that adopted by the colleges should be introduced in high schools. The earlier transfer of students to college was to be made on an individual basis. The following resolution of the Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association represented the general opinion reached on the subject of acceleration in high schools:

12. *Ibid.*, March 3, 1942, p. 7.

13. *Ibid.*, April 15, 1942, pp. 4 f.

We urge that, during the war emergency, selected students who have achieved senior standing in high school and who will, in the judgment of high school and college authorities, profit from a year's college education before they reach selective service age, be admitted to college and, at the end of the successful completion of their freshman year, be granted a diploma of graduation by the high school and full credit for a year's work towards the fulfillment of the requirements for the bachelor's degree or as preparation for advanced professional education.¹⁴

The National Association of Secondary School Principals and state departments of education were opposed to any change. The former believed that "the many war-time curriculum offerings of the high school provide for youth not yet 18 years of age the best preparation and training for future services in the armed forces and for the production of essential war-time materials and foods." The state departments wished to limit the number of students selected for advancement to college by such qualifications as "superior," "exceptional," "of unusual ability," "of social maturity," and "of emotional stability."¹⁵

HIGH SCHOOL VICTORY CORPS

In the middle of 1942 the war activities of youth in high schools were brought to a focus by the organization of the High School Victory Corps. Official responsibility for the Federal Government in developing this organization was delegated to the U. S. Office of Education. The plan in general was approved by a National Policy Committee consisting of representatives of the War and Navy Departments, the Department of Commerce, the U. S. Office of Education Wartime Commission, and the Civilian Aeronautics Administration. The plan was endorsed by Paul V. McNutt, Chairman, War Manpower Commission; Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War; Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy; and Jesse H. Jones, Secretary of Commerce.

A national pattern, rather than a national organization, was recommended for the Victory Corps, which was "basically an educational plan to promote instruction and training for useful

14. *Ibid.*, June 15, 1943, p. 10. The issue presents (pp. 10 ff.) a summary of the action by associations on admission of high school seniors to college.

15. *Ibid.*, p. 11.

pursuits and services critically needed in wartime." The purpose of the plan was defined as follows:

We are engaged in a war for survival. This is a total war—a war of armies and navies, a war of factories and farms, a war of homes and schools. Education has an indispensable part to play in total war. Schools must help to teach individuals the issues at stake; to train them for their vital parts in the total war effort; to guide them into conscious personal relationship to the struggle.

Students in the Nation's 28,000 secondary schools are eager to do their part for victory. To utilize more fully this eagerness to serve, to organize it into effective action, to channel it into areas of increasingly critical need, the National Policy Committee recommends the organization of a Victory Corps in every American high school, large or small, public or private.

The Policy Committee urges the organization of the Victory Corps as a high school youth sector in the all-out effort of our total war, a sector manned by youth who freely volunteer for present service appropriate to their experience and maturity, and who earnestly seek preparation for greater opportunities in the service which lies ahead.¹⁶

The two objectives of the wartime programs of the high schools to which the Victory Corps was related were as follows:

(1) The training of youth for that war service that will come after they leave school; and (2) the active participation of youth in the community's war effort while they are yet in school. The first seems closer to what goes on in school classrooms and shops; the second to the out-of-school activities of students. The Victory Corps organization takes account of both.¹⁷

To give a list of the activities included in the Victory Corps program would be to repeat the activities presented earlier in the account of the preinduction training program. All students were eligible to membership, provided they participated in a school physical fitness program appropriate to their abilities and needs in the light of their probable contribution to the nation's war effort. They were required to be pursuing studies of prob-

16. *High School Victory Corps*, U. S. Office of Education, Pamphlet No. 1, 1942, p. 1.

17. *Ibid.*, p. 5.

able immediate and future usefulness to the war effort and to be participants in at least one wartime activity or service.¹⁸

The Victory Corps was designed as much for promoting and maintaining the morale of youth as it was to provide training. The wearing of insignia, a simple uniform (a white shirt with dark trousers for boys and a white waist and dark skirt for girls), initiation ceremonies with rituals of induction into membership, participation in parades and other community ceremonies—all these were elements in developing consciousness of participation in the war effort. To link youth and adult in this effort the formation of a Victory Corps Advisory Committee in each community was recommended. In January, 1943, Captain Eddie Rickenbacker became chairman of the Victory Corps Policy Committee.

The Victory Corps was organized in six divisions, each with its own insignia: general membership, production service division, community service division, land service division, air service division, and sea service division. In addition to the specialized work of each division, members participated not only in the community activities listed earlier but also in selling war savings stamps and bonds, in salvage campaigns, and in collecting waste paper. Perhaps an added inducement to activities of an extra-curricular and community nature was the fact that credits could be obtained for participation. This was recommended by those responsible for the organization.

College entrance requirements, as well as requirements for graduation from high school, need adjustment in wartime. The substitution of war service, war production, and other forms of participating work experience in critically needed occupations for class attendance may be encouraged, at least during the period of the war emergency, without lasting damage to the student's education. State and regional accrediting associations must adjust their requirements. A campaign of community education to break down the

18. This was defined as "air warden, fire watcher, or other civilian defense activity; U.S.O. volunteer activities; Red Cross services; scale model airplane building; participation in health services, such as malaria control; farm aid, or other part-time employment to meet man power shortages; school-home-community services, such as salvage campaigns, care of small children of working mothers, gardening, book collection, etc."—(*Ibid.*, p. 15.)

existing prejudices in favor of the strictly academic college preparatory types of high school course is also required. Naturally such a campaign will require the vigorous leadership of the professional educators.¹⁹

The preinduction training program, the Victory Corps program, and the funds available for the promotion of vocational training all combined to produce a new emphasis in the high school curriculum. This was not accidental but was deliberately designed. Thus it was urged that "The High Schools Should Prepare Youth for War Production and Essential Community Services" for the following reasons:

A realistic appraisal of our need for trained manpower, both in the armed forces and in war production, makes it evident that the high school can't go on doing business as usual. High school youth are impelled by patriotic considerations to point their training to preparation for war work, to tasks requiring skill of hand and strength of body, coupled with intelligence and devotion. The 28,000 high schools of the Nation with their 6,500,000 students should speedily undertake the adaptation of their curricula and of their organizations to train youth (and adults, also) to do their part in the victory effort.²⁰

It is difficult to estimate the contributions of the Victory Corps. The organization and its plans received a great deal of publicity for a year or so, but no general report to indicate the extent to which it was adopted by the high schools or its effectiveness was published.

NEW EMPHASES IN THE CURRICULUM

A survey of the educational literature of the war years raises the question whether the appeal to youth to do their part in the victory effort was not directed too much toward the immediate demand for man power. That this demand was inescapable cannot be questioned. Nevertheless, in view of the fact that for most of the war industries short-term schemes of vocational training had been developed, greater emphasis might well have been placed on the importance of the long view of education in the

19. *Ibid.*, pp. 22 f.

20. *Ibid.*, p. 4.

lives of youth. Strongly influenced by the constant appeals to contribute to the war effort and attracted by high wages, youth could hardly be blamed for "jumping the gun" and leaving school without completing the high school courses. The Go-to-School Drive came only after thousands of boys and girls had already left school. How successful this drive was it is impossible to say; the large number who left school and never returned were to create a serious problem in the years immediately following the war.

It could not be expected, of course, that education could be conducted as usual. Nevertheless, something might have been learned from Great Britain and Canada. In both countries the emphasis in secondary education was not transformed; the normal programs were carried on and pupils were prepared for the regular examinations. Both teachers and pupils participated energetically in all types of war activities outside school hours. The English Board of Education urged in a circular, issued in the early days of the war, that the fundamentals must be retained: "This means in elementary schools 'the three R's' and class teaching of various subjects such as history and geography; and in secondary schools it means something similar with the addition of languages and mathematics." The effect of participation of Canadian pupils in war-related activities—selling war certificates, raising war funds, collecting contributions and making garments for the Red Cross, and collecting salvage, taking courses in first aid and nursing, and assisting in farm work in summer—was described as follows by the Minister of Education of Ontario in his report for 1941:

Pupils generally have applied themselves more zealously to their school work, and have come to realize the direct bearing of much of their studies on the practical affairs of life. The events of the war from day to day have been used quite frequently by both teachers and pupils to give an added interest to various subjects, and undoubtedly these young people have now acquired a clearer understanding of the issues involved in the war. All these efforts must, in turn, help determine every pupil's ideal in life and his choice of a vocation.

The situation was not exactly parallel in this country, in which some 70 per cent of youth between fourteen and eighteen were

enrolled in secondary schools, as contrasted with a far smaller percentage in Great Britain and Canada, where the majority of adolescents were already engaged or employed in wage-earning occupations. Nevertheless, the difference in emphasis is worth noting.

The nonvocational program of the high school was not completely ignored. Attention was frequently directed to the importance of English, social studies, mathematics, and science, in which serious deficiencies had been revealed. The emphasis on the study of Latin-American relations in the schools, which had already been begun before the war, was actively promoted by the U. S. Office of Education and the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. An important contribution was made in this area by the American Council on Education which, in 1943, appointed a Committee on the Study of Teaching Materials on Inter-American Subjects. The Committee directed its attention to an analysis of the inter-American content in educational programs and publications with a view to promoting accuracy and objectivity. In a foreword to the report of the Committee, published under the title *Latin America in School and College Material*, Dr. George F. Zook, president of the American Council on Education, stated the problem of teaching materials about foreign countries in its larger setting:

Observation of trends in organized social life today leads inescapably to the conviction that education in this country must give all citizens sensitive understanding of other lands and peoples. Today more than ever before it is necessary for us as a people to be correctly and adequately informed about other national groups. With them we share a common destiny; about them we must be widely and deeply informed.²¹

When the attention of the country was turned by the war to the Far East, the U. S. Office of Education undertook to provide study materials on China, India, Japan, and the East Indies for the use of schools and appointed a specialist, Dr. C. O. Arndt, to develop plans to promote Far Eastern studies. Interest in these studies spread rapidly and was stimulated by a number of or-

21. *Latin America in School and College Material*, Washington, D. C., 1944, p. vii.

ganizations, such as the East and West Association and the American Association of Teachers Colleges.²²

The war inevitably stimulated a quickened interest in the promotion of education for international understanding, which became still further intensified by the deliberations at Dumbarton Oaks and San Francisco on the creation of the United Nations and the work of that organization in New York City in 1946. At the Twenty-fourth Representative Assembly of the National Education Association, held in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, on July 6, Dr. John W. Studebaker, U. S. Commissioner of Education, emphasized in an address the long-term responsibility for "Youth Education for International Understanding." Since they indicate the outlines of a program which may be organized for high schools and colleges, Dr. Studebaker's analysis of the subject matter of education for international understanding is quoted herewith:

This subject matter seems to me to fall under four broad headings. First, there is history with its account of the experiences of the race in the long struggle for freedom and self-government.

A second major field of subject matter deals with contemporary problems. Here the student must come to understand the forces—economic, political, social, scientific, and ideological—which help to mould the pattern of events in our time. I might add parenthetically that the schools have more often failed to make students aware of these forces of contemporary life than they have to acquaint them with historical facts.

A third subject-matter heading is political economy. Through education our young people should become well informed concerning the instruments which men have devised, their political forms and their social and economic systems, for protecting the rights of the individual and for increasing his freedom through self-government.

And, finally, there is knowledge concerning the different resources, customs, peculiarities, and cultures of other peoples, the possession of which will help to temper our judgments and to broaden our sympathies toward our associates in the enterprise of world peace and good will. It is with educational activities in this

22. For examples of contemporary practices in teacher-education programs on the Far East see *Education for Victory*, June 20, 1945, pp. 11 f.

last category that "education for international understanding" has been commonly concerned.

And yet I submit that all four of the categories I have mentioned constitute the necessary subject matter of education for international understanding. With appropriate adaptations for the maturity of the student these various bases for an intelligent understanding of the world should be taught in elementary schools, in the high schools and colleges; sometimes in courses in English and in history or in other social-studies, and sometimes as separate "courses".

The particular organization of the subject matter for teaching purposes, whether in terms of history of geography or political economy or cultural areas or some other principle of organization is relatively unimportant so long as all American boys and girls now and in the years ahead become informed concerning the facts and see their implications for international understanding, peace, and good will.²³

The introduction of courses on Latin American relations and on Far Eastern relations, and a program of education for international understanding at once raises the question where time can be found for such studies in the curriculum of the high schools. In view of the deficiencies which were revealed in those subjects—English, mathematics, sciences, and foreign languages—which the high schools profess to teach, there is always the danger that the introduction of new courses may result in a smattering of knowledge and superficiality. How serious the problem is was brought to the attention of the country by the results of an American history test conducted by the *New York Times* in 1942. The report of the survey revealed the widespread existence among the 7,000 students in thirty-six colleges who took the test of lack of knowledge and much misinformation about the history of their country. Even admitting the fact that the test itself was open to serious criticism, the results did indicate that something was wrong with the status and teaching of American history. The conclusion of the *New York Times* investigator that the subject was not taught in high schools was proved to be incorrect. An inquiry conducted by the U. S. Office of Education showed that the subject was required to be taught in thirty-eight

23. *Education for Victory*, July 20, 1944, p. 1.

states and was established by practice in all others.²⁴ Nevertheless, the report of the *New York Times* did arouse grave concern and led to the appointment by the American Historical Association, the Mississippi Historical Association, and the National Council for the Social Studies of a committee to survey the situation.

The Committee, under the chairmanship of Dr. Edgar B. Wesley of the University of Minnesota, was intrusted with the task of promoting the improvement of the teaching of history in schools and colleges, of investigating teaching and textbooks, and of discovering the number of students in elementary and high schools who were studying the subject. The Committee did not find that the subject of American history was neglected in the schools but attributed the inadequacy of the results to the inadequate preparation of teachers and poor methods of instruction, a conclusion that would have been reached if any other subject had been investigated.

The Committee strongly advocated the teaching of history as history and not under some label which might substitute contemporary problems for the continuity of approach. It stated its belief that

There are values in the study of systematic and organized bodies of materials; for an understanding of society and its problems the study of the slow evolution of institutions and nations is necessary. The careful study of history will result in an understanding of chronology, continuity, cause and effect, and of trends, forces, and movements.

The Committee therefore recommends (1) that United States history continue to be offered in the middle grades, in the junior high school, in the senior school, and in college, and (2) that the use of history as an approach be emphasized in all social studies courses. This study of national history should not be isolationist in tone or outlook, since our students will be affected by world events as well as by those which take place within our borders. American history should, therefore, be taught with continuous awareness of the relations between the United States and the rest of the world. Moreover, the history of the United States cannot be fully understood without knowledge of the history of other countries. The

24. *Education for Victory*, May 1, 1943, p. 3.

Committee therefore recommends that all high school students take a course in world history.²⁵

The same point of view had already been stressed in a Statement of Wartime Policy adopted by the National Council for the Social Studies and issued in 1942 under the title *The Social Studies Mobilize for Victory*. Here the Commission on Wartime Policy recommended that "a three-year sequence in history and contemporary problems should be a 'constant' in the senior high school," and that "in the study of United States history special attention should be given the world relations—economic, social, and political—of the United States." History was definitely recognized as a subject distinct from the courses labelled as "social studies," but contributory to them. In a report by the Advisory Commission on Postwar Policy of the same Council, *The Social Studies Look Beyond the War*, Washington, D. C., 1944, the importance of the historical approach to the understanding of postwar problems was again stressed:

We strongly endorse the increase in attention, stimulated by the war, to the long story and to the traditions and ideals of democracy, together with efforts to provide experience in its practice in classrooms and in school life . . . Specifically, the Commission recommends that the history of our freedoms and rights, of the development of government of the people, by the people, and for the people should be included in world history and American history at each grade level where they appear (p. 20).

The Commission not only recommended the study of the history of the United States in the setting of world history, but directed attention to the need of Americans to be familiar with the history and civilization of other peoples:

Other countries and peoples have long been studied to a considerable extent both in our elementary and secondary schools, whether in terms of courses in history and geography or of major themes relating to human and social development or major areas of human living. The Commission strongly endorses such study, believing that it grows in importance as peoples and nations grow more interdependent and as American national interests widen. The war

25. Edgar B. Wesley, director of the Committee, *American History in Schools and Colleges*, New York, 1944, pp. 62 f.

has directed attention not only to the existence of a dangerous amount of prejudice and intolerance in the world but to related gaps and deficiencies in our school program for building knowledge and understanding of peoples in other Americas, in the Far East and the Pacific area, and in the Soviet Union. The current interest of many educational and other organizations and groups in the school program as it relates to these areas and groups, and to intercultural education, should hasten desirable curriculum changes, the production of needed materials, and the improvement of teacher preparation. The Commission urges.

- continued and, where necessary, increased attention to the history, geography, and life of other countries and peoples at both the elementary and secondary levels
- systematic presentation of the elements that make up civilization and of the story of the development and inter-relationships of civilization in the West and the East
- inclusion, in both elementary and secondary schools, of attention to neglected areas and peoples, particularly in the other Americas, the Far East and Pacific area, and the Soviet Union, and of minority as well as majority groups in Europe and America
- recognition that while the story of nations as political units cannot be ignored, the story of democracy, of changing economic life, of institutions concerned with human welfare and individual development, and of religion, literature, music, art, and science should be included in any adequate program for the development of effective citizenship
- recognition that the school programs in literature, music, art, and science, as well as in social studies have important responsibilities for developing knowledge and understanding of other peoples and of world civilization, and that whenever practicable, joint planning should be undertaken (pp. 26 f.).

Emphasized as strongly as the study of history *quâ* history and contemporary problems, made intelligible through the study of history, was the study of world problems as almost inseparable in modern life from the study of domestic problems. The Commission pointed out that

Experience in the war has reminded us forcibly of the need for emphasis, throughout the programs of the school and the social studies, on the interdependence of all nations and peoples, on de-

mocracy as the way of life which we have fought to preserve and extend, and on the need for integrity and morality not only in the individual and in national life but in international relations (p. 16).

THE UNREST IN SECONDARY EDUCATION AND PROPOSALS FOR REFORM

As was pointed out earlier, dissatisfaction and unrest have prevailed in secondary education for many decades. While in the elementary schools this period had seen considerable experimentation with methods of instruction, in the high schools experimentation had been more concerned with matters of the curriculum and content. The serious obstacle to successful experimentation, however, was the absence of a recognized and accepted philosophy of education, as Dr. Thomas H. Briggs had frequently pointed out. The result was a conglomeration of traditional subjects, which were under constant criticism, and innumerable subjects added periodically to meet the supposed needs of students as individuals and to prepare them for the immediate requirements of practical life. In a scheme of things in which any subject taught for the same length of time was as good as any other subject, educational values disappeared. The war revealed the serious deficiencies which had accumulated—deficiencies in English, mathematics, science, and history, to which foreign languages might have been added. It did not need the war, however, to reveal these deficiencies. Attention had already been drawn to the absence of recognizable standards in the work of the high schools, first by Dr. Thomas H. Briggs in *The Great Investment* (1930) and then by Dr. John L. Tildsley in *The Mounting Waste of the American Secondary School* (1936).²⁶

Little attention was paid either to these criticisms or to the deficiencies revealed during the war years. One argument for ignoring the criticisms was that it was not the function of the schools to anticipate war needs. Another was based on the magnificent showing of the G.I.'s, whose average educational level was two years of high school as contrasted with about six years of elementary education in World War I. The conclusion drawn from this fact, *post hoc propter hoc*, was that all was right with education. Little attention was paid to the fact that those subjects

26. Both books were published in the Series of Inglis Lectures in Secondary Education, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.

in which deficiencies were revealed were the same subjects which in the years before the war had been attacked as "academic" or "traditional" or good only for college entrance but not for life. Those who assumed responsibility for the reconstruction of secondary education apparently refused to learn anything and proceeded blithely with their plans as though the criticisms could be ignored once the crisis was over.

The task which the United States has undertaken in the movement to make secondary education as universal as elementary education is as formidable as it is unprecedented. This movement is not only inevitable but is warranted from the social point of view. But if the theory that education yields dividends²⁷ in men and women better prepared for work, citizenship, and life in a democratic society is to have any real meaning, the high school curriculum must consist of something more than a congeries of accretions and improvisations or of innovations to meet immediate needs of the moment. One result of these accretions was that the high schools of the country were offering more than two hundred courses, all of them of equal value as measured by the quantitative standard that any subject is as good as any other taught for the same length of time. Such a measure meant the disappearance of educational values. The expansion of the curriculum was "more in the nature of patchwork additions than fundamental reforms in the instructional program."²⁸ Unlike the secondary school²⁹ in other parts of the world, the American high school has become the school for all adolescents. It represents the attainment of a great democratic ideal. It has an obligation both to the society which provides and maintains the schools and to the students who enjoy the privilege and opportunity offered to them. The issue today is how that obligation can be met.

In the latest pronouncements on secondary education the pendulum swung from the alleged rigidity of the traditional academic curriculum and its formal organization by subjects to

27. See Will French, *Education and Social Dividends*, New York, 1935.

28. *What the High Schools Ought to Teach*, American Council on Education, Washington, D. C., 1940, p. 10.

29. In the postwar reforms in England, Scotland, Northern Ireland, and France, where it is proposed to provide some form of secondary education for all up to the age of fifteen or sixteen, the traditional character of secondary education will also be changed.

a curriculum adapted to the assumed needs of all youth and of contemporary society. In a pamphlet on *What the High Schools Ought to Teach*, prepared by a special committee for the American Youth Commission and Other Cooperating Organizations and published by the American Council on Education, the recommendations were based on the following general statement:

The change in pupil population is compelling secondary schools to modify their curricula. The pupils of today come from every level of society and have every possible expectation with respect to their future careers. The program of instruction which may possibly have been appropriate when the pupils were few and selected does not fit at all the needs of the great majority of those now in secondary schools. . . . Since many prospective citizens do not continue their education beyond the secondary schools, it seems evident that instruction with regard to society cannot be postponed to the period of college attendance. If the general populace is to be intelligent about the issues that confront communities and the nation, there must be instruction in the secondary schools with respect to these issues (p. 7).

The secondary schools, it was urged, must accordingly provide an education which is to be preparatory for all contingencies of life. The use of the school years as a preparation for self-education—*apprendre à apprendre* as French educators put it—is ignored, and the promise and prospects of adult education, whose paramount importance in a democracy is beginning to be appreciated more than ever, are not even mentioned. A few years ago it was the fashion to reject the traditional curriculum because its values were “deferred” and to insist that it should be replaced by a curriculum that possessed immediate and affirmative value for the students. Education, it was then claimed, is life and not a preparation for life. But even this theory seems now to be discarded, and the young adolescent is to be given a capital endowment while in secondary school, which will enable him as a member of the general populace to be intelligent about the issues that confront communities and the nation. The assumption seems to be made that the current issues which confront communities and the nation will always remain the same, or that they can be anticipated.

The Committee was of the opinion, which cannot be disputed,

that the present curriculum of secondary schools is in the nature of patchwork additions, and proceeded to urge fundamental reforms in the instructional program. Accordingly, the Committee recommended that

while it would be a mistake to make sweeping charges as to the ineffectiveness of all secondary education, it is legitimate to urge fundamental reconsideration of the curriculum, particularly in view of the fact that there are a great many pupils in secondary schools for whom the courses now administered in these schools are not appropriate. Even where particular courses and certain parts of other courses are entirely defensible, the complete curriculum must be described as inappropriate, because of its emphasis on items that do not accord with the ability or the outlook on the future of the majority of the pupils (p. 11).

This statement is surprising in view of two facts. The first is that the high schools of the country have been offering more than two hundred courses, which should have provided sufficient flexibility for the selection of courses appropriate to the needs and abilities of all pupils. The second is that so little seems to have been achieved as a result of the innumerable commissions and committees which have studied the problems of secondary education in general and of secondary school subjects in particular during the past thirty years. The general tenor of the reports of these commissions and committees has been to stress individual differences and the provision, in a sufficiently flexible array of subjects, of programs adapted to the varying needs, interests, and abilities of the pupils.

The report on *What the High Schools Ought to Teach* recommended that secondary education should be "adjusted to the needs of all young people;" those who have the ability to pursue the academic studies are apparently to be denied that opportunity. Greater attention is in fact given to pupils of low ability and to slow learners than to the able, because, one may infer, "it has been found that a great many pupils in these [secondary] schools have reading abilities of the fifth or even of the fourth grade level." That the progress of slow learners may be due to lack of interest in a particular subject or lack of proper motivation for study was admitted in the report, but it was also admitted that "if devices can be found for appealing to pupils in such a

way as to stimulate them to maximum endeavor, they very frequently show capacity that was covered up by lack of interest or lack of proper motivation." This, however, is the only suggestion in the report that pupil failures may possibly be due to inferior or incompetent teaching, or to the fact that, as a result of the rapid increase in enrollments, many teachers were giving instruction in subjects which they had themselves never studied. Apart from the somewhat complacent and defeatist acceptance of the condition that the high school curriculum must be adapted to the abilities of fourth and fifth grade readers, the report continued to follow the tendency, well marked in all reports on secondary education in the past thirty years, to attribute the causes of pupil failure to the subjects of instruction rather than to incompetent teaching.

The Committee stressed the importance of "books as means of education" and was critical of "a strong disposition in some quarters to decry the use of books as means of education."

Curiously enough [the Committee continued] those who criticize books are among the loudest in their demand that illiteracy should not be tolerated in the land. "All people ought to read" is a slogan which is universally accepted as valid. Why, then, is there neglect at the higher levels of the kind of instruction which would make it possible for pupils to take advantage independently and fully of the recorded experiences of the race? Why have schools left many of their pupils only partially trained, confused because they are incompetent, unable to interpret what would be of great advantage if understood, and victims of verbalism which is in some cases the fault of books, but more commonly the fault of untrained minds? (p. 14).

Here, if anywhere, the Committee had an opportunity to discuss fully the place of the recorded experiences of the race, the cultural heritage, in a sound concept of education. The Committee did not seize it, but suggested as a corrective of the confusion, incompetence, inability to interpret, and verbalism that "what the schools need is a widespread emphasis on library methods, by means of which pupils will be introduced to interesting materials that appeal to their individual tastes and curiosities and given the training which will make them independent readers." And yet the very deficiencies which the Committee noted

may well be the result of the corrective which it recommends—hasty skimming of many books, “book reports,” “research activities,” “creative writing” and “creative self-expression,” all of them devices adopted to make both the academic and the practical subjects interesting and to provide the right kind of motivation, but none of them directed to removing “the fault of untrained minds” or initial inability to read.

The traditional curriculum, it is again alleged, as has been alleged for many decades, has failed; the reasons for that failure, it is claimed, are among others the changing character of the secondary school clientele, the great variety of abilities, the wide diversity of outlook as to future careers, and the lack of suitable devices to secure proper motivation and to stimulate interest. The constant shift and uncertainty of the aims of secondary education and the accumulation of innumerable objectives, which prompted a recognized leader in the field, Dr. Thomas H. Briggs, to state a few years ago that secondary education was being developed without the guidance of a philosophy of education, and the diversified and equally uncertain standards of certification for high school teachers, which accounts for the presence in high schools of large numbers of teachers ignorant of the subjects which they are assigned to teach—these are conveniently ignored. From the failures of pupils the transition to the claim that the subjects of instruction have failed was easy, and still another effort was made to adjust the curriculum to the needs of the pupils and to the demands of contemporary society.

The result of the effort to reconsider the secondary school curriculum was a proposal to replace the traditional subjects by reading, work experience, and social studies. The Committee advocated work experience in order to meet a natural urge of young people to give expression to their energy. The educational value of work experience rests apparently on the acquisition of ability to work steadily for eight hours a day, an ability which is not a natural possession. Work experience is not designed to develop vocational skill but to cultivate habits of steady work. Vocational training as such is differentiated from work experience, since “the fact is that a large proportion of the workers in America are engaged in routine jobs that require little skill or training.” Besides developing habits of steady work, it is assumed

that from the inclusion of work experience "greater enthusiasm for school education may result." The Committee further assumed, but also without evidence, that "there is no factor of general education which is more important to consider than work. This statement should not be thought of as applying merely to a few marginal cases but should be accepted as a principle of the widest possible application." No one would deny the importance and value of work, but whether it contributes and how it contributes to general education might well have been discovered from the work experience of the vast majority of American youth in the past as well as in the present. Further proof is needed for the assumption that "a pupil gains, through the constructive handling of tools and materials, insight into the nature of things and insights with regard to his environment that he cannot gain in any other way."

The first two fundamentals recommended for inclusion in the reconsidered curriculum of the secondary schools are reading and labor as education. The third fundamental course is to consist of social studies.

A long list of topics which should replace some of the material now used in many history and civics courses can be set down on which young people should be able to form wise judgments based on knowledge of the facts. A few examples of such topics may be given: housing, conservation of natural and human resources, community planning, cooperatives, pressure groups and their methods of influencing legislation, the stock exchange, corporations, labor organizations, the industries of the nation, various forms of municipal government, governmental services such as those of the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, and Labor, the origin and nature of money and systems of exchange, international relations, consumers' needs, and investments (p. 23).

To assess the value of this program it is essential to remember the background against which it is advocated—the inability of a large proportion of high school pupils to read, the fault of books and the fault of untrained minds, and the failure to invent suitable devices to provide proper motivation and to stimulate interest. The topics are to be arranged

so as to correspond to the maturity of pupils. While controversial topics can with propriety be discussed with older pupils, it would

be disquieting to younger pupils to attempt to understand some of the intricate and frequently unsolved problems of social life about which violent disagreements exist (p. 23).

The conventional subjects, it was urged, should be "reexamined and criticized with a view to injecting into them the same liberal spirit as that which is exemplified in the new courses" which are advocated. In English pupils should have "contact with writings that are at once intellectually stimulating and adapted to their mental and reading abilities"—those of fourth and fifth grade readers. Courses in mathematics should concentrate on certain fundamentals—understanding of equations, translation of a table of figures into a graph, and knowing something about functional relations. "If attention were concentrated on these fundamentals and others of like type which are indispensable to general mathematical thinking, it would be possible to eliminate from the secondary school curriculum some of the abstruse refinement and highly specialized methods of mathematical manipulation which now confuse pupils," but which teachers, who have specialized in mathematics, and parents, who are wedded to the tradition, ignorantly or narrow-mindedly insist on retaining, and the mastery of which was to be found, soon after the report appeared, so essential in the country's greatest crisis. Foreign languages, according to the report, consume too much time, much of which could be better spent on the newer courses. "Courses in natural sciences are now far too often mere encyclopedic lists of the findings of scientific research. They often fill the memory with facts rather than stimulate pupils to scientific thinking." The separation of facts from thinking is itself interesting. The Committee admitted that "competent teachers here and there succeed in making these courses means of vital, effective thinking" but failed to pursue the logic of its own admission, that competent teachers are the only guarantee of successful instruction in this or in any other subject. The Committee clearly considered the traditional curriculum to be bookish, nasty, and long. Had it but been as sympathetic to the academic subjects as it was enthusiastic about work experience, the Committee might have urged, as oped as much in academic as in other aspects of the school proof of equal importance, that habits of steady work need to be devel-

gram and might have disposed of the notion that effort can be dispensed with if studies are adapted to the needs, abilities, and interests of the pupils. Finally, after thirty years or more of tinkering or "reconsideration" of the secondary school curriculum, there is no guarantee whatever that new plans for reform will succeed until the American public is convinced that it must secure teachers of the ability and competence commensurate with the great ideal which it has accepted—the education of all youth. "Devices" alone and "curriculum reconsideration" alone will not save the situation.

The Committee which prepared the report on *What the High Schools Ought to Teach* concluded with the statement:

Some central agency seems, however, to be necessary to bring the issues of curriculum revision more prominently to the attention of the general public and of teachers. There has long been some recognition of the problems with which this report deals and there have been promising innovations in the curriculum introduced at various centers. What is required now is a vigorous effort on the part of central agencies . . . and energetic classroom teachers to produce the changes in secondary school programs that are long overdue.

One such agency, the Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association, issued a report in 1944 on *Education for All American Youth*. In the opening chapter on "The History that Should Not Happen," which purports to consist of "quotations that may possibly be found in the concluding pages of some standard history of education *published some twenty years from now*," the statement is made that the schools were unprepared for the war³⁰ but showed ability to react to a national wartime crisis, and that "no one seems to have noted that the familiar (prewar) pattern, too, was shattered beyond repair; that the end of the war was the end of an epoch to which there

30. Dr. James B. Conant, president of Harvard University, however, in an address delivered at the fiftieth anniversary convocation at Teachers College, Columbia University, on November 15, 1944, said, "If one asks what the schools of this country have accomplished in the last fifty years, one need only refer for answer to the American Army and Navy in these days of triumphant battle."

could be no return, in education or in any other aspect of life" (p. 4).³¹

The Committee responsible for the preparation of the report on *What the High Schools Ought to Teach* concluded its work in 1940, before the outbreak of the war, and could not at that time anticipate the difficulties of the Army, Navy, and other services in securing personnel adequately equipped in mathematics, sciences, and foreign languages—parts of "the familiar prewar pattern of education." The Educational Policies Commission, however, must have been fully informed of these difficulties as well as of the widespread fear lest the Army and Navy educational program would result in an over-emphasis on vocational and technical training, a fear which at the college level resulted in appointment of local and national committees to discuss measures to preserve the ideal of a liberal education. Looking backward from 1946 the Educational Policies Commission claimed that "the reason for the incapacity of education during the post-war years was the tremendous pressure of the traditional educational program," forgetting that the traditional pattern of education began to be shattered some thirty years ago, when the quantitative measure of education—the units, credits, points system—was adopted and any subject began to be considered as of equal value with any other subject taught for the same length of time, and when the doctrine of formal discipline was assumed to have been "exploded." The result for a long time had, in fact, been the absence of any pattern, whether in high schools or colleges, other than the completion of the requisite number of units or points.

The Commission recommended the organization of curricula and courses which would take into consideration the major types of educationally significant differences among American youth, the significant characteristics common to them all, and the provision of educational programs to meet the common needs of all youth and the special needs of each individual. The point of view of the Commission was that

Every youth in these United States—regardless of sex, economic status, geographic location, or race—should experience a broad and

31. This was written after an extensive literature had already appeared on the meaning of a liberal education and the place of the humanities in it.

balanced education which will (1) equip him to enter an occupation suited to his abilities and offering reasonable opportunity for personal growth and social usefulness, (2) prepare him to assume the full responsibilities of American citizenship; (3) give him a fair chance to exercise his right to the pursuit of happiness; (4) stimulate intellectual curiosity, engender satisfaction in intellectual achievement, and cultivate the ability to think rationally; and (5) help him to develop an appreciation of the ethical values which should undergird all life in a democratic society (p. 21).

The education of the majority of youth was expected to continue from the seventh to the fourteenth grade, the last two years in the community institutes which were to be provided more generally in the future. In Grades VII, VIII, and IX, the period of common secondary education, a common program was to be provided to help the pupil

to grow in knowledge and understanding of the world in which he lives; in ability to think clearly and to express himself intelligently in speech and writing; in his mastery of scientific facts and mathematical processes, and in his capacity to assume responsibilities, to direct his own affairs, and to work and live cooperatively with other people (pp. 35 f.).

Through a wide range of experiences in "intellectual, occupational, and recreational fields" the pupil was to have "a broad base for the choices of the interests which later he will follow more intensively." In the later grades the curriculum, organized into three fields—occupations, intellectual pursuits, and recreational interests—was to be differentiated to suit the needs of each individual; while the common fields—education in the responsibilities and privileges of citizenship, family living, health, and understanding and appreciation of the cultural heritage—would be continued. The cultural heritage is nowhere further defined, nor are any designated fields or sequences to be followed as prerequisites for admission to higher educational institutions until the student enters the community institutes. Teachers would be expected to suggest "tailor-made" learning experiences adapted to the interests and abilities of each pupil in the common integrated courses which would form the bulk of the curriculum. Through the integrated courses pupils would acquire such

knowledge as they may need of history, language and literature, sciences and mathematics, with the provision of remedial work for the backward and of extra time for the able pupils to pursue their special interests in these fields. What would happen if a pupil fails to recognize the needs of these subjects is not indicated.

The traditional organization of the curriculum by subjects would be discarded in favor of "areas of learning," and the course itself would be an adventure for all, pupils and teachers alike. The "areas of learning" proposed for Grades X to XIV of a rural high school and community institute are as follows:

Preparation for Occupations

Study and practice related to occupational preparation (including work in science, mathematics, social studies, English, or foreign language preparatory to advanced study in college or university, as well as education for agricultural, mechanical, commercial, and homemaking occupations)

Education for Civic Competence

Community studies and civic projects, extending into larger areas (including "The World at Work")

Historical study of Man's Efforts to Achieve Freedom and Security"

Investigation of current political, economic, and social problems; study of their historical backgrounds; and civic projects

Personal Development

Family life, health, and mental hygiene (including the domestic, personal, and health aspects of consumer economics)

Recreational and leisure-time interests, including physical education

Understanding and appreciation of the cultural heritage

"The Scientific View of the World and of Man"

Historical study of "Man's Efforts to Achieve Freedom and Security"

Literature and the arts

Elective studies or individual projects, or (in Grades X-XII) remedial instruction in English or mathematics, if needed (p. 153).

Apparently the so-called subjects would be taught incidentally as the need for them arose. According to the time-distribution given for the program, about 13 per cent of the total num-

ber periods for the five years are to be devoted to "Understanding and appreciation of the cultural heritage" and then only in the first three years. And even if a pupil felt disposed to devote all the time assigned throughout the course to elective studies or individual projects in this "area of learning," the time allotment would still be only 25 per cent of the total.

The "areas of learning" would be designed with an emphasis "on the present living of youth, on the improvement of community life, and on such practical matters as competence in occupations, citizenship, and family living." These, it is assumed, would "develop the discipline of sustained intellectual effort needed for success in advanced academic and professional study." The argument is as follows: "For one thing, most of a student's learning at Farmville (where the rural high school and community institute are located) is directly *related to his purposes*. The student *wants* to do something, either as an individual or as a member of a group. He applies himself diligently to learn the things needed to do what he wants to do, and thereby develops habits of application and industry." This is the progressive theory that children and youth can embark on an educational exploration or adventure without any idea of their destination or a preliminary study of the map.³² The teachers would serve as guides and counselors and participate with their students in organizing the content of the "areas of learning." In the end the student would presumably emerge with such knowledge, ideas, and values as are related and suited to his purposes and wants.

The same general principle of integrated "areas of learning" in terms of vocational and civic needs, adapted in turn to individual interests and abilities would be followed in the urban high school and community institute. Here the program consists of the following "areas of learning":

Individual Interests

Elected by the student, under guidance, in fields of avocational, cultural, or intellectual interest.

Vocational Preparation

Includes education for industrial, commercial, homemaking, service, and other occupations leading to employment, apprenticeship, or

32. "Then it doesn't matter which way you go," said the cat. "So long as I get somewhere," Alice added as an explanation.

homemaking at the end of Grade XII, XIII, or XIV; education for technical and semiprofessional occupations in community institute; and the study of sciences, mathematics, social studies, literature, and foreign languages in preparation for advanced study in community institute, college, or university. May include a period of work under employment conditions, supervised by the school staff. Related to the study of economics and industrial and labor relations in "Common Learnings."

Science

Methods, principles, and facts needed by all students.

Common Learnings

A continuous course for all, planned to help students grow in competence as citizens of the community and the nation; in understanding of economic processes and of their roles as producers and consumers; in cooperative living in family, school, and community; in appreciation of literature and the arts; and in use of the English language. Guidance of individual students is a chief responsibility of "Common Learnings" teachers.

Health and Physical Education

Includes instruction in personal health and hygiene; health examinations and follow-up; games, sports, and other activities to promote physical fitness. Related to study and community health in "Common Learnings" (p. 244).

In the discussion of the curriculum there appears to be some uncertainty as to values. On one page the Commission is of the opinion that the first of "the imperative educational needs" of youth is to be equipped to earn a living in a useful occupation; on the next page the statement is made that education in family living is according to some teachers "second to nothing in importance;" and a few pages later education in community competence is declared by the Commission to be "paramount in importance." The possible objection that the traditional subjects of the secondary school curriculum have been neglected is met by the following statement:

There were some who feared—quite mistakenly, as it turned out—that this course would put an end to the systematic study of bodies of knowledge, such as the sciences, mathematics, history, and languages. This objection was withdrawn, however, when it was

shown that there would be ample time in the total program for any student who wished to do so, to complete all the courses in the subject fields required for admission to college or university, even by those institutions which still hold to their pre-war requirements. Moreover, it was asserted, the conventionally required subjects would appear in the new course, insofar as they were needed to meet the common needs of all youth. English language, literature, history, and science would certainly be found among the "Common Learnings," though possibly in unaccustomed settings (p. 238).

The Commission also anticipates the criticism that the organization of the proposed course is loose and might result in aimless shifting from point of transient interest or need to another without sustained intellectual effort. The criticism is countered with the statement that "the needs to be met would be clearly defined by the staff for each year of the course. There, to be sure, the planning-in-advance-for-everybody would end. Within the broad outlines of each year's work, each teacher and class would be free to plan and organize its own learning. But planning and organization, in itself, is an act which requires no mean intellectual effort." The Commission offers no evidence whatever to support its claims and assertions. The objection, which is founded on experience, that the proposed program would result in superficiality and that classes would "gallop off in all directions at once" is met with the reply "that here, as everywhere, the quality of learning would depend upon skilful teaching." Neither this Commission nor any other committee which has devoted attention to the revision of the secondary school curriculum has ever entertained the notion that failure in the past may have been due to the absence of an adequate number of competent teachers and of skillful teaching. It is always assumed that the quality of learning and teaching will be improved by the magic of curriculum revision. *Omne ignotum pro magnifico*; the latest innovation is always the best until the next one is invented. The systematic study of bodies of knowledge is not regarded as of any value in a general education, but is set aside as one of the vestigial remains sanctioned by requirements for admission to college or university.

There is a confusion, in the Commission's report, between training and education—training in and for the immediately con-

temporary problems of living and education for life and for self-direction. The school years are to be devoted to acquiring all the equipment of knowledge and information which it is assumed that the students will need through adult life rather than a body of ideas, principles, and values which will not only inform that knowledge but also cultivate interest to pursue it further. One of the major blocks of the course is to be devoted to preparation for a useful occupation, despite the admission that "Most workers in factories and many workers in offices, stores, and maintenance shops perform a relatively small number of operations a great number of times. Workers can be trained for most repetitive jobs after they have been employed and in a comparatively short time. Furthermore, the training often requires specialized and expensive equipment which is not now available in our schools." Again, "the high-school counselors recognize that, unfortunate though it may be, many workers in routine jobs will have to find their chief enjoyments and satisfactions during their leisure time." Nevertheless the major part of the students' time is to be devoted to vocational preparation, while "the development of avocational interests which will endure and expand through the years of adult life" is to be left to elective periods, for which only a small fraction of the time schedule is assigned.

In discussing principles of teacher education and selection the Commission warns against "the influence of members of college and university faculties who are unacquainted with the needs of public schools and who apparently believe that specialized training in subject matter alone is adequate to prepare a young man or woman to teach in a secondary school." It therefore recommends that "every teacher should comprehend the purposes of public education in a democratic society," should be "prepared to assume his own obligations as a citizen," and should understand "how the school may serve as an agency for developing civic responsibility." Professionally educated to understand boys and girls, and familiar with scientific information regarding child development and the psychology of learning, "every teacher should have both a liberal education and thorough preparation in the field which he expects to teach. Specialization alone is not enough, for in the secondary school of today, the competent teacher must be able to see and teach the relationship

of his particular subjects to the whole of education and the whole of life." A fuller and more detailed definition of the meaning of a liberal education, to which the Commission refers, would have been desirable. It would also have helped to clarify the function and place of the teacher with a "thorough preparation in the field which he expects to teach" in a course made up of occupational, social, and recreational studies which are stressed throughout the report.

In the historical retrospect, "The History that Must Be Written," no further reference is made either to a liberal education or to preparation in a special field. Instead, the changes which are expected to have taken place since 1940 are as follows:

First, there was a great strengthening of instruction in educational psychology, individual differences, human relations, adolescent psychology, human growth and development, and educational guidance and counseling. . . . Second, the study and teaching of school and community relations and of educational sociology were greatly strengthened. Prospective teachers were given more close firsthand contacts with other community institutions as well as with the schools. . . . Third, the expansion of the school program in the fields of guidance and vocational training has resulted in a parallel expansion of the program for preparing teachers in these fields (pp. 407 f.)

There is an apparent discrepancy between the principles of teacher education as defined in one place and the anticipation of the historian of what is more likely to happen.

The National Association of Secondary School Principals published a summary of *Education for All American Youth* in a pamphlet, *Planning for American Youth*, with suggestions for implementing the proposed program. It was proposed that superintendents of public schools appoint Commissions on Postwar Education to recommend improvements in the high school program. Such Commissions should consist of school people (elementary and high school principals and teachers), laymen representing citizens' and vocational advisory committees, and directors of research, curriculum, and instruction. It is significant that the inclusion of representatives of college education is not suggested. In the past the high schools protested, not without justification perhaps, against the dominance of college entrance requirements.

In the new dispensation the pendulum swung to the opposite extreme. In the past the nonacademic students were the forgotten youth; in the future the position, according to the recommendations of the report on *Education for All American Youth*, is to be reversed, and the forgotten youth may be those who have both the ability and interest to pursue academic studies. Provision for such studies will be made "though possibly in unaccustomed settings."

The Report of the Harvard Committee, *General Education in a Free Society*, which appeared only a year later than *Education for All American Youth*, dealt in part with the same problems but in the larger setting of their relation to American democracy and to college education. The Committee deliberately sought to avoid those social divisions which might result from an educational program limited in its objectives to the average or below average and differing in quality and quantity from the needs of those likely to continue their education beyond the high school. The question to be answered, according to the Committee, "*is how can general education be so adapted to different ages and, above all, differing abilities and outlooks, that it can appeal deeply to each, yet remain in goal and essential teaching the same for all?*"³³ The Committee, indeed, did not ignore differences in social and cultural backgrounds or in intellectual abilities, or in vocational or professional needs. It considered the importance of both general and special education, although it discussed in detail only the former. At the same time, the fact that vocational preparation may vary in range from a few weeks of training to the longer period required for professional studies was not ignored. The major premise of the Report was stated as follows:

Taken as a whole, education seeks to do two things: help young persons fulfill the unique, particular functions in life which it is in them to fulfill, and fit them so far as it can for those common spheres which, as citizens and heirs of a joint culture, they will share with others. Obviously these two ends are not wholly separable even in idea—much less can preparation for them be wholly separate (p. 4).

33. Italics in the original, p. 93.

The high school, according to the Committee, has ceased to be a preparatory school in the old sense of the word, but

In so far as it is preparatory, it prepares not for college but for life. The consequences of this transformation for every phase of the high school are incalculable and by no means yet fully worked out. This mighty and far-reaching fact in itself gives rise to one of the main themes of this report . . . how, given this new character and role of the high school can the interest of three-fourths who go on to active life be reconciled with the equally just interests of the one-fourth who go on to further education? And, more important still, how can these two groups, despite their different interests, achieve from their education some common and binding understanding of the society which they will possess in common? . . . The ideal is a system which shall be fair to the fast as to the slow, to the hand-minded as to the book-minded, but which, while meeting the separate needs of each, shall yet foster that fellow feeling between human being and human being which is the deepest root of democracy (pp. 8 f.).

The Committee recognized the danger of too early differentiation in the education of those who would enter on a wage-earning career upon leaving high school and those who would continue to college, and for this reason emphasized the importance of common education:

Democracy, however much by ensuring the right to differ it may foster difference—particularly in a technological age which further envisages division of function and hence difference of outlook—yet depends equally on the binding ties of common standards . . . For to the degree that high schools try to prepare the majority for early entrance into active life by giving them all sorts of practical, immediately effective training, to that degree something like a chasm opens between them and the others whose education is longer. And in this chasm are the possibilities of misunderstanding and class distinctions (p. 12).

The Educational Policies Commission report sought to find a solution "in striking a dull average, satisfactory to neither the quick nor the slow;" the Harvard Committee aimed to recognize individual differences and at the same time to provide a common background for all students on the principle that

democracy is not only opportunity for the able. It is equally betterment for the average, both the immediate betterment which can be gained in a single generation and the slower groundswell of betterment which works through generations. Hence the task of the high school is not merely to speed the bright boy to the top. It is at least as much (so far as numbers are concerned, far more) so to widen the horizons of ordinary students that they, and, still more, their children will encounter fewer of the obstacles that cramp achievement (p. 11). . . . The hope of the American school system, indeed of our society, is precisely that it can pursue two goals simultaneously: give scope to ability and raise the average. Nor are these two goals so far apart, if human beings are capable of common sympathies (p. 35).

The important difference between the two reports under consideration is that, while both emphasize the importance of education in "common understandings" or "common standards," or "general education," the Harvard report rejects a differentiation in quality between secondary and college education, for

The root idea of general education is as a balance or counterpose to the forces which divide group from group within the high school and the high school from the college. But in so far as general education is also conceived as an organic strand running through the successive years of high school and college, then it should play the same binding, unifying part for the individual as well. Certainly it will fail unless it does so (p. 14).

For the high school as for the college the Harvard Committee recommends a program of general or liberal education, a term which in *Education for All American Youth* is mentioned only in connection with the preparation of teachers but is not further defined. The Harvard Committee advocates the same common strand of education for all students in high school and college, without excluding the demands for special education or that part of education "which looks to the student's competence in some occupation." General education is defined as follows:

Clearly, general education has somewhat the meaning of liberal education, except that, by applying to high school as well as to college, it envisages immensely greater numbers of students and thus escapes the invidium which, rightly or wrongly, attaches to liberal education in the minds of some people. But if one cling to

the root meaning of liberal as that which befits or helps to make free men, then general and liberal education have identical goals. The one may be thought of as an earlier stage of the other, similar in nature but less advanced in degree (p. 52).

The important contribution of the Harvard Report lay in the attempt to introduce some order and sequence into what had become a chaotic collection of subjects. The Educational Policies Commission, it is true, attempted to do the same thing but recommended a catch-all, called "common understandings," with academic studies taught "possibly in unaccustomed settings." At the center of the program of general education, at school and again at college, the Harvard Committee placed three areas of man's life and knowledge—"the physical world, man's corporate life, his inner visions and standards" or natural sciences, social sciences, and humanities. The three areas will be discussed in connection with plans for the reorganization of the college curriculum.

The success of this or of any other program, however, "depends finally on the teacher's quality of mind and spirit." Other conditions affecting the teacher's status—salaries and freedom from direct political control—must also be safeguarded. The central issue as much social as it is educational. For, to quote the Report,

Surely the hope of a sound general education is in teachers who are themselves generally educated.

But, as was said, these hopes will not be fulfilled automatically, and the conditions of teaching will not improve until more and more qualified people embark on it in a spirit of devotion. One of the tragedies of our times has been the change of teaching from a calling to something like an industry. The fault, as has been argued, is at once with the colleges, which have turned their backs; with the schools of education, which have taught everything except the inevitable thing, the love of knowledge; and with American society itself, which has tolerated the conditions under which many students and their teachers still labor. The remedy is a joint concern both of the public and of the people who so believe in the importance of high-school teaching as the floor and foundation of democracy that they will go into it as a calling (p. 26).

Here is the real challenge to American education, more important perhaps than curriculum revision—to secure a body of teachers who in quality of mind and spirit are competent to give reality to the great ideal of American democracy. Innumerable efforts have been made to revise the curriculum, to adapt it to the needs and interests of boys and girls, to adjust it to changing social demands, but while a library of books has been written on the subject, the comparable amount of space devoted to the teacher as the most essential element in the process of education would hardly take up more than a few pages. Postwar developments have proved the fact that the American public has not recognized the key position of the teacher in giving reality to the great ideal of equality of educational opportunity for all.

So far as the function of secondary education is concerned, an examination of the facts revealed during the war justify the conclusion that they point to the type of education advocated in the Harvard Report rather than to that proposed by the Educational Policies Commission.

■

HIGHER EDUCATION

STUDENTS AND SELECTIVE SERVICE

HIGHER EDUCATION, including colleges, universities, professional schools, teachers colleges, normal schools, technical institutes, was more seriously affected by the war than any other branch of American education. That these institutions could not escape the dislocation that inevitably results in wartime was to be expected. It was clear, however, that there was no concerted plan to deal with the problems of higher education when the Selective Service System was introduced in 1940. Nor was there any disposition, for obvious reasons, to make special provisions for students as a class. The only concession made in the early years was to permit the deferment of the induction of students into the armed forces until they had completed the academic year in which they received their call, and then draft boards were authorized to deal with each case individually, with such recommendations as the institution attended by the applicant would submit. It was some months before the need of maintaining a continuous supply of trained men in fields directly related to the "national health, safety, or interest" was recognized and a definite program of occupational deferment of students in training and preparation in such fields was adopted. Despite the measures that were adopted, acute shortages in many areas in which trained personnel was needed for the war effort did develop.

The uncertainties faced by the institutions of higher education were matched by the uncertainties of youth who were faced with the question whether patriotic duty demanded that they enlist voluntarily or that they continue their programs of study until their call came. The issue was clearly stated on two occasions by President Roosevelt. In a letter quoted in the *Washington Post* of August 15, 1940, the President wrote:

Reports have reached me that some young people who have planned to enter college this fall, as well as a number of those who attended college last year, are intending to interrupt their education at this time because they feel that it is more patriotic to work in a shipyard or to enlist in the Army or Navy, than it is to attend college. Such a decision would be unfortunate.

We must have well-educated and intelligent citizens who have sound judgment in dealing with the difficult problems of today.

We must also have scientists, engineers, economists and other people with specialized knowledge to plan and to build for national defense as for social and economic progress. Young people should be advised that it is their patriotic duty to continue the normal course of their education unless and until they are called so that they will be well prepared for greatest usefulness to their country.

They will be promptly notified if they are needed for another patriotic service.

Almost a year later, on July 22, 1941, the President, in a letter addressed to the American College Publicity Association, again emphasized the same position:

The message I would emphasize to you this year is that America will always need men and women with college training. Government and industry alike need skilled technicians today. Later we shall need men and women of broad understanding and special aptitudes to serve as leaders of the generation which must manage the post-war world. We must, therefore, redouble our efforts during these critical times to make our schools and colleges render ever more efficient service in support of our cherished democratic institutions.

The President's point of view was shared in general by the administrative authorities in the institutions of higher education, as may be illustrated by the following excerpts from a letter addressed to members of the student body by Chancellor H. W. Chase of New York University, April 10, 1941:

I would urge all our students who had planned to continue their work in the University next year, or who have been in doubt as to their plans, not to interrupt their training unless it is imperatively necessary.

We shall need in this country, as never before, all the trained personnel that can be mustered to cope with problems that will in-

evitably follow in the train of current world-wide stress and disorder. You young people now in college are the nation's most valuable reserves. We must not unnecessarily deplete this reservoir. Far better, for your own good and the country's, that the training you are now receiving be carried forward assiduously and without interruption, now, to logical objectives, than that it be thrust aside for some more immediately appealing pursuit. . . .

We must not permit tension of the times unnecessarily to disrupt normal procedures. We are moulding the University program at every turn to national defense needs, without abandoning, however, fundamental studies, and we ask the cooperation of our students and their parents in the pursuance of this policy.

So far as students of draft age were concerned, their status under Selective Service regulations had by this time been clearly defined. Those already enrolled in an institution of higher education were required to register for the draft and were permitted at first to continue their programs until the end of the academic year and later to the end of the semester or quarter in which they were enrolled. Students preparing for the ministry in theological or divinity schools were required to register but were exempted from training and service from the start. Some nine months passed, however, before a formula for occupational deferment was developed. On March 18, 1941, a formula was reached under which local boards could grant occupational deferment to "any registrant found to be a 'necessary man' in any industry, business, employment, agricultural pursuit, governmental service, or any other service or endeavor, or in training or preparation therefor, the maintenance of which is necessary to the national health, safety, or interest in the sense that it is useful or productive and contributes to the employment or well-being of the community or the nation." A month later the areas for the individual occupation deferment of students were defined as chemistry and engineering (civil, electrical, chemical, mining and metallurgical, mechanical) in which a dangerously low level of man power was found to exist.

To these areas the following were added, as soon as shortages were discovered in them, engineering (agricultural, sanitary), dentistry, medicine, pharmacy, physics, biology and bacteriology, and geology (geophysics, meteorology, hydrology, cartography).

Later in 1941 veterinary medicine, osteopathy, naval architecture, and marine engineering, teachers in secondary schools, industrial engineers, and students in preparation for production, operation, and maintenance of airplanes were added to the list of areas which draft boards could consider for occupational deferment. When the new registration of men twenty to forty-four years of age inclusive took place on February 16, 1942, occupational deferment for potentially necessary individual students in fields necessary to the national health, safety, and interest and war production was continued.

The results of a survey undertaken by the American Council on Education on "The Supply of Professionally Trained Manpower" in *Higher Education and National Defense*, Bulletin No. 26, April 10, 1942, showed serious shortages in a number of areas not included in the lists submitted to the draft boards. The survey was undertaken at the request of the National Roster of Scientific and Specialized Personnel on behalf of the National Resources Planning Board, which had been requested by the Executive Office of the President of the United States to make "a survey of the nation's needs for professionally trained manpower and of the resources of the nation to meet these needs." The report of the American Council on Education was based on replies to questionnaires received from 1,280 of the 1,799 colleges, universities, professional and technical schools, and teachers colleges to which questionnaires had been sent. The results showed (1) the number of students graduating with their first general or special degrees, and trained for 104 categories listed under management and administration, agriculture and biology, medicine and related fields, engineering and physical sciences, social sciences, arts and languages, and clergy; (2) the number of students completing postgraduate work and available for full-time employment; (3) a report on faculty personnel; and (4) a record of the facilities and resources of the institutions available for training increased numbers of students.

The issue of student deferment was not stabilized, however, until the beginning of 1944, and after the system of specialized training for the Army and Navy had been established in colleges and universities. *Activity and Occupational Bulletin* No. 33-6, first issue on March 1, 1943, amended on January 6, 1944, and

effective on February 15, 1944, announced a change of policy whereby students occupationally deferred were "limited to a number sufficient to meet civilian needs in war production and in support of the war effort." National quotas were determined under which occupational deferment could be granted to undergraduates in certain scientific and specialized fields or in professional courses of study. For undergraduates certified as competent and giving promise of the successful completion of a course of study by July 1, 1944, could be deferred in the following areas: aeronautical engineering, agricultural sciences, automotive engineering, bacteriology, chemical engineering, chemistry, civil engineering, electrical engineering, forestry, geophysics, marine engineering, mathematics, mechanical engineering, meteorology, mining and metallurgical engineering (including mineral technology), naval architecture, optometry, petroleum engineering, physics (including astronomy), radio engineering, and sanitary engineering. The competence and promise of students were to be certified by the institution attended, and by the National Roster of Scientific and Specialized Personnel of the War Manpower Commission.

For undergraduates expected to graduate after July 1, 1944, the number of areas for occupational deferment was reduced to chemistry, engineering, geology, geophysics, and physics. Students in recognized professional schools (medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine, and osteopathy), internes and preprofessional students in these fields of study and theology could be considered for occupational deferment. A national quota of 10,000 students was established for students eligible for occupational deferment in chemistry, engineering, geology, geophysics, and physics; for students in preprofessional schools the quota was not to exceed 50 per cent of the total average number of students in schools of medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine, osteopathy, or theology.

The uncertainties affecting both students and institutions of higher education were not relieved when the plans for establishing Enlisted Reserve Corps in the Army, Navy and Army Air Forces, under which a certain number of college students possessing superior qualifications would be permitted to enlist and "remain for the time being in an inactive status in order to con-

tinue their education." Students who enlisted in Reserve Corps were subject to call at any time and were in no better position than students who did not enlist but were eligible for occupational deferment, if they were found to be "potentially necessary men." The decision was still left to the individual.

In the middle of 1942, Congress appropriated funds to provide loans to students in order to maintain the supply of technically trained men and women. The loans were to be granted to assist students participating in accelerated programs in colleges and universities in engineering, physics, chemistry, medicine (including veterinary), dentistry, and pharmacy, provided that their technical or professional education could be completed within two years. The number of students to be assisted was to be determined by the chairman of the War Manpower Commission, which had been created by the President's Executive Order of April 18, 1942. Appropriations for such loans, amounting to \$5,000,000 to the National Youth Administration and \$5,000,000 to the Federal Security Agency, were allotted. Loans could be made in amounts not exceeding tuition and fees plus \$25 per month, and not exceeding \$500 to any one student during any twelve-month period. Interest at the rate of 2½ per cent was to be charged. Indebtedness was to be canceled if a student were ordered into military service, or who suffered total and permanent disability or death.

HIGHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS IN COUNSEL

The uncertainties of the situation, created as soon as a state of emergency was announced by President Roosevelt in 1939 and the Selective Service Act was passed in 1940, affected the institutions of higher education more seriously even than it did the students. Only one point was clear—that the experiment of World War I with the Student Army Training Corps (SATC) did not justify a repetition, even if the Army had had a sufficient supply of officers to distribute to the colleges and universities. Ready to place all their resources at the disposal of the government, the authorities in institutions of higher education waited for leadership and guidance. These were provided when in 1940 the National Committee on Education and Defense was organized under the auspices of the American Council on Education

and the National Education Association. The American Council on Education, established in 1918 as a coordinating agency in the field of higher education, had in the twenty years preceding the outbreak of World War II gradually assumed a strategic position in all matters concerning higher education, while the National Education Association could speak with authority for all branches of education. Cooperating in many ways with the Wartime Commission, which was set up in December, 1941, by the United States Office of Education and in which both organizations were represented, the interests of all aspects of education in the country were covered. When the Joint Army and Navy Committee on Welfare and Recreation was appointed by the Secretaries of War and the Navy, the Executive Committee of the National Committee was designated as its Subcommittee on Education, with Dr. Francis J. Brown, a member of the staff of the American Council on Education, as its secretary.

The National Committee on Education and Defense was made up of one representative from each of sixty national organizations under the joint chairmanship of George F. Zook, president of the American Council on Education, and Willard E. Givens, executive secretary of the National Education Association. The purposes of the National Committee were defined at its first meeting on August 5, 1940, as follows:

1. Immediate and continuous representation of organized education for effective cooperation with the National Defense Council, the Federal Security Agency, and other Governmental divisions.
2. Stimulation and coordination of the efforts of educational organizations and institutions in projects related to the national defense.
3. Dissemination of information regarding defense developments to educational organizations and institutions.
4. Maintenance and improvement of educational opportunities essential in a long-range national program.

The activities of the National Committee were carried on through an Executive Committee of eighteen members and through the following subcommittees: Military Affairs, Education, Women in College and the National Defense, Pre-Service Education, Vocational Training, and Pan American Relations.

The Subcommittee on Military Affairs had been created in April, 1940, by the Committee on Education and Defense of the American Council on Education before the National Committee was organized. The American Council, through the publication of a series of bulletins, *Higher Education and National Defense*, initiated on August 1, 1940, provided an important medium of information and interpretation on all matters concerning the relations of colleges and universities to national defense, and particularly on regulations affecting the status of students under the Selective Service regulations.

On February 6, 1941, the National Committee on Education and Defense held a conference in Washington, D. C., which was attended by approximately 500 persons, representing 361 colleges and universities and 42 states. Every aspect of the situation confronting the country and the institutions of higher education was discussed: the organization of defense councils, counseling students on courses for defense needs, assisting students in filling out Selective Service questionnaires and making requests for deferment, potential services of the institutions in defense activities, community services (caring for children of needy families, assisting in recreational activities, tutoring high school pupils, and conducting adult education classes), and promoting education for democracy and study of current issues. The immediate challenge was clearly stated by Dr. Francis J. Brown as follows:

The fourth function of defense committees is that of seeking to maintain a sane balance between immediate and long-range defense needs. This is no easy task. The colleges and universities desire and seek in every way to render the greatest possible service to the immediate needs of the defense program. Yet they are also the repository of the rich heritage of knowledge, of research and research techniques, and of culture in a chaotic world bent upon destruction of the learning of the ages accumulated by the intellectual labor of centuries of patient effort and brilliant insight. These skills and knowledge cannot be conserved in libraries and documented records alone. They must remain vital and realistic through the inculcation of this living heritage in the endless stream of young men and young women who pass through our institutions of higher learning. We must develop in each an alertness of mind and soundness of judgment, based upon a depth of knowledge and a breadth

of understanding. This is a responsibility to future generations of which the colleges should not and must not lose sight.¹

This challenge all the colleges and universities were prepared to meet. Their chief concern, however, was with the immediate status of students and enrollments which would enable them to carry on the program. They did not request nor was it the intention of the authorities to treat students as "a privileged class." To quote a statement made at the conference by Brigadier General Lewis B. Hershey, Director of Selective Service:

The World War taught us that regardless of the apparent necessity it was decidedly demoralizing to relieve any occupational class from liability to serve in the armed forces. This fact must be borne in mind in any consideration of selective service and college personnel. The prospective leaders of our future are today in colleges. Every care must be exercised to prevent a condition in which the personnel of colleges would appear to the general public as a group which has special privileges. . . . I do not believe that the colleges can afford to be accused of demanding privileges which appear to be for the benefit of the individuals concerned.²

Colleges and universities were urged by General Hershey to make the necessary adjustments demanded by the situation, but while the issues were stated, little guidance was to be found in the principle that consideration would be given to students and faculty members. One of the serious obstacles to the formulation of a general principle or formula lay in the fact that the nature and demand for man power in the armed forces, in government and war industry could not be anticipated and, as events proved later, were subject to fluctuations. General Hershey suggested the following questions for consideration by institutions of higher education:

What can the colleges do to adjust their organizations and methods of operation to fit in with the operation of the Selective Service Act? What can be done by them to permit a student to remain in school until his induction time arrives? Is the educational system sufficiently flexible to train a student until he is inducted and to re-

1. American Council on Education Studies. *Organizing Higher Education for National Defense* (Washington, D. C., 1941), p. 37.

2. *Ibid.*, pp. 23 f.

ceive other students immediately after they are discharged from the service? To what extent can the rigidity of semesters and quarters be varied to permit individual adjustments of men entering or leaving the service? To what extent will the administrative staffs of the colleges be willing to differentiate between students in order to aid local boards in the decisions which they must make? Will the local board be confronted with the request from the colleges for a deferment of each member of the faculty and each student, or will it be possible for discrimination to be used by the leaders in the colleges and thereby lighten the task of the local boards and perhaps insure the deferment of the worthy and the non-deferment of the others? ³

The fundamental issues facing the country rather than the colleges and universities were discussed in sectional meetings. Speaking for state universities and land-grant colleges, Dr. Guy Stanton Ford reported that there was agreement on two points, namely:

First, in the troubled days ahead, both internally and externally, there is an intensified obligation upon universities to maintain with courage upon their campuses the atmosphere of free discussion and teaching characteristic of institutions of higher learning in a democracy and the first to be suppressed in a totalitarian state. It was recognized that in times of war or intense defense activity we can with confidence appeal to our faculties and student bodies to maintain these functions upon a level which will make them defensible. This is vital to the preservation of democracy against the many groups who, with a narrow intolerance and an unconscious totalitarian philosophy that they do not realize, seek to press upon all who think and teach the simple solutions derived from their narrow views, their prejudices, and their intolerances.

Second, the great ongoing task of service, teaching, and research focussed in state-supported institutions and in all institutions of higher learning must proceed with as little disturbance as possible and with a consideration throughout all readjustments for the adequate performance of these traditional duties.

By making ourselves responsible upon these two points we continue and magnify our services to democracy and justify ourselves as a bastion in the ramparts that we defend.⁴

3. *Ibid.*, p. 26.

4. *Ibid.*, pp. 44 f.

As if in answer to Dr. Ford's statement, Dr. Raymond Walters pointed to the obstacles to carrying out "the great ongoing task of service, teaching, and research," when he stated that in the discussions of the section of private and municipal universities

It was brought out in one of the talks from the floor that deferment of service for college students, which General Hershey questioned, does not mean exemption from service and cannot, if viewed in the light of the whole situation, be regarded as special privilege. The successful operation of colleges and universities of the country depend vitally upon the maintenance of student enrollment during a given year. Assurance to the student of completion of the year is, in peacetime, a great factor toward stabilized enrollment. The educational and scientific preparedness which colleges and universities supply is an indispensable part of national preparedness.⁵

This section proposed that the War and Navy Departments or some other federal authority should designate certain areas of professional and technological training, such as medicine, engineering dentistry, chemistry, and advanced physics, in which properly certified students should receive deferment not for one year but for the entire period of their professional education. As indicated in the earlier discussion in this chapter of the deferment of students, this proposal was ultimately put into effect.

The fundamental question on which institutions of higher education were waiting for enlightenment was clearly stated by President Edward C. Elliott in his "Commentary and Afterthought" on the conference when he said, "While listening to the many wide-ranging discussions today there came to my mind, time and again, the disturbing question: *Has education yet been given a proper place in the massing and organization of the powers of the nation for defense?*"⁶

Some time was yet to elapse before this question was answered. It was not available when another Conference of Government Representatives and College and University Administrators was held in Washington, D. C. on July 30-31, 1941, under the sponsorship of the Subcommittee on Military Affairs of the National Committee on Education and Defense. The purpose of the Conference, according to Dr. Zook, was

5. *Ibid.*, p. 49.

6. *Ibid.*, p. 66.

To help give direction to the earnest efforts of colleges and universities to cooperate in the national defense, and to find those ways in which they can effectively serve the nation, primarily in this period of great emergency, but also for the eventual time of reconstruction after the present emergency is over.⁷

The colleges and universities were represented by delegates from each of the following national organizations: American Association of Junior Colleges, American Association of Teachers Colleges, American Association of University Professors, Association of American Colleges, Association of Land-grant Colleges and Universities, Association of Urban Universities, National Association of State Universities, and National Catholic Educational Association. The position of the War Department with reference to colleges and universities was reported by Lieutenant Colonel W. A. Burruss as follows:

In the first place, the War Department has felt, and still feels, that a good schooling of mind and body is a positive source of strength in any event; that the college world, in carrying out its normal role, is making a most important and necessary contribution to national defense; in other words, it favors education as such as a part of national defense. It, therefore, favors the continued operation of educational institutions with as little disruption as possible, and it has not attempted in any way to advocate or sponsor a re-orientation of college courses.⁸

This report on the attitude of the War Department was encouraging, but, as will be pointed out later, the work of colleges and universities was disrupted by force of circumstances. The Conference succeeded in defining the task ahead of the institutions, but the institutions were still waiting for something more than statements from the authorities that they favored education and hoped that their operation would be continued without disruption. The state of affairs in the middle of 1941 was clearly indicated in the following statement contained in the summary of the proceedings of the Conference:

It was increasingly apparent that all governmental agencies recognize that education as such is national defense; that it is of vital

7. American Council on Education Studies. *Higher Education Co-operates in National Defense* (Washington, D. C., 1941), p. iv.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 5.

importance to maintain a continuous supply of men and women trained in mind and body; and that the college, through more effective instruction and guidance, can make a most important and necessary contribution to national defense; and that government agencies favored "the continued operation of educational institutions with as little disruption as possible and have not attempted in any way to advocate or sponsor a reorienting of college courses."

The mechanization of military defense and the expansion of industry require increasing emphasis upon mathematics, science, and technical skills, but it was continuously emphasized that this should be accomplished without losing sight of the basic importance of a liberal education. "The needs of total defense require that the individual student maintain a balance between technical-scientific training and a knowledge and appreciation of basic social and economic life."⁹

At its meeting on November 6, 1941, the Executive Committee of the National Committee on Education and Defense still found it urgent to recommend the preparation by the National Committee of "a forceful statement emphasizing the necessity of maintaining education at a high level of effectiveness during the present emergency" and its wide circulation through governmental agencies and educational institutions. And after the attack on Pearl Harbor and the entrance of the country into World War II the same questions and the same issues that had been discussed in the almost two years preceeding December 7, 1941, were again raised. In the issue of the Bulletin No. 19 (December 20, 1941) of *Higher Education and National Defense* of the American Council on Education appeared the following statement:

War changes values for the nation and for the individual. Some immediate goals become more urgent than long-range objectives. Traditions are less binding upon policies. Only one question is now uppermost in the minds of administrators, teachers and students in our colleges and universities—"How can this institution, how can I, as an individual, best serve the nation?"

The answer calls for calm judgment and deliberation,—for prompt though never ill-advised action. It entails cooperative planning on a national basis between institutions of higher learning and many agencies of the government. The answer calls for a careful

appraisal of the courses and activities of institutions to determine their value to the individual both in the immediate and the long-range view. It requires the making of essential adjustments to speed up the educational process but without loss of effectiveness of the training. It demands the consideration of modifications of requirements to meet the needs of men leaving the service. Flexibility must characterize every aspect of the institution, but changes should be governed by known needs of the nation and of the individual. Basic training programs should be maintained at the highest possible level. Special programs should be added as needs may demand.

This same calm judgment should govern the decision of students and faculty. For many the immediate urge is to enlist, to make whatever sacrifices such service may imply. For some this may be the means through which they can best serve. For the majority, the more difficult because the less dramatic task will be to continue their education, to develop qualities of leadership or technical knowledge or professional skill and thereby utilize their abilities to the fullest degree.

This attitude of judgment has characterized the policy of Selective Service. There have been no changes in the regulations and procedures regarding occupational deferment for students or postponement of induction. As the need for manpower increases, some changes will inevitably result but not without adequate consideration of the need for maintaining a continuing supply of trained persons in the necessary occupations and professions.

How to compromise "between the urgency of present training needs and the established future needs for professionally trained men and women in the social order" was still a pressing issue which was discussed at the so-called Baltimore Conference on Higher Education and the War, held on January 3-4, 1942. The Conference of college and university presidents was sponsored by the National Committee on Education and Defense and the United States Office of Education, and provided an opportunity for an explanation of national policies and needs by officials of the government and for an exchange of experiences among administrators of higher institutions of education. The Conference, attended by one thousand college and university executives from forty-six states, Puerto Rico, and Canada, was the largest of its kind ever held in the United States. Again the

Conference was informed by a representative of the War Department that

The War Department believes in the continuation of the educational processes with as little disruption as possible. It does not feel that we should temporize with the situation. The demands made upon the colleges and universities by the War Department will be to meet only the established needs of the army.¹⁰

And in the same vein the representative of the Navy Department stated that

The future of our democratic institutions rests upon the continuance of the highest and best types of education for the youth of our country who will be necessary for the attack upon post-war problems of industry, of labor, and of government. . . .

You have in your colleges just the type of young man we need to officer our two-ocean navy. So also do you have the precise type of leader required by our army for their even more greatly expanded force. Some interference with the normal college programs is therefore inevitable, but I can assure you that, in so far as we can, we will minimize such interference. As the exigencies of war vary, so also will the degree of necessary interference vary.¹¹

After nearly two years of conferences and discussions, the United States Commissioner of Education, John W. Studebaker, could still define the problem before colleges and universities in the following terms:

If we can evolve out of this conference and out of some others in smaller groups within the next few weeks some very definite, workable, and necessary proposals to keep this country well stocked with the necessary ability to prosecute this war to a successful conclusion, I have confidence that our government will support us and will respond to our requests. The problem is to get what we really want that will join the interests of the educational interests of the country with the necessities of the government in carrying forward this war effort. It remains with us to demonstrate whether or not we have the wit, the sagacity, and the courage to think out

10. American Council on Education Studies. *Higher Education and the War* (Washington, D. C., 1942), p. 29.

11. *Ibid.*, p. 32.

the policies for programs that American education can carry out. . . . I have great confidence, on the basis of the experience of the last eighteen months, that if we crystallize our thinking as American leaders of education on the concrete proposals that need to be made, the proposals will certainly be given very favorable consideration. And I think they will be accepted. . . . Now let's find out how we can present a constructive program.¹²

The bewilderment and confusion that spread through institutions of higher education after Pearl Harbor was clearly illustrated in a series of telegrams which were addressed to the Office of Education and read at the Conference. The time had obviously come for that concerted action which had been honorably mentioned for two years but had not been put into operation. The Conference, after pledging "to the President of the United States, Commander-in-Chief of our nation, the total strength of our colleges and universities—our faculties, our students, our administrative organizations, and our physical facilities" recommended:

A. ALLOCATION OF TOTAL MAN POWER

1. Institutions of higher education cooperate to the fullest extent with the National Resources Planning Board and other federal agencies responsible for surveys (a) to determine the immediate needs of man power and woman power for the essential branches of nation service—military, industrial, and civilian, (b) to determine the available facilities of colleges and universities to prepare students to meet these needs, and (c) to appraise the ultimate needs in professional personnel for long-term conflict and for the post-war period, in order that a continuous and adequate supply of men and women trained in technical and professional skills and in leadership to meet both immediate and long-range needs shall be maintained;

2. There be brought to the attention of the President the necessity of issuing a statement of national policy which will avoid competitive bidding for faculty and students by government agencies and by industry and will conserve adequate personnel on all levels of education to assure the effective instruction of youth and adults, in order to provide a continuous supply of trained men and women;

3. The United States Office of Education Wartime Commission

12. *Ibid.*, pp. 59 ff.

be requested to study and develop appropriate plans for the solution of the problems of (a) how to meet the teacher shortage in elementary and secondary schools and the shortage of workers for community programs, and (b) how to supplement the training of present and potentially available teachers and other workers for new and changing responsibilities;

4. The United States Office of Education Wartime Commission offer its service for cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture, the Executive Committee of the Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, and the Conference of Negro Land-Grant Colleges to assure an adequate supply of county agents, 4-H club leaders, home demonstration agents, and other leaders in

B. ACCELERATION OF EDUCATION PROGRAMS

5. All institutions of higher education give immediate consideration to ways and means for accelerating the programs of students through such extension of the annual period of instruction and such adjustments of curricula as may be consistent with national needs and with educational standards, and as may be possible with available resources.

6. Desirable acceleration of programs of higher education should be accomplished without lowering of established standards of admission.

7. An immediate study be made by the National Committee on Education and Defense and the United States Office of Education Wartime Commission of desirable articulation in the academic calendars of the secondary schools and the colleges to facilitate acceleration of total educational progress.

8. An immediate study be made by the National Committee on Education and Defense and the United States Office of Education Wartime Commission as to the needs for and bases of federal financial assistance to higher education (including junior colleges), for the duration of the emergency, in order that the training of students for national service may be accelerated.

C. EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION

9. The National Committee on Education and Defense and the United States Office of Education Wartime Commission be requested to assemble and publish accounts of changes made by educational institutions in the interest of war service.

D. CREDIT FOR MILITARY SERVICE

10. Credit be awarded only to individuals, upon the completion of their service, who shall apply to the institution for this credit and who shall meet such tests as the institution may prescribe. In cases in which degrees are of distinct advantage to students in the service, it is recognized that some departure from this practice, or an individual basis, may be justified.

E. HEALTH

11. All colleges and universities take such steps as will be necessary to bring each individual student to his highest possible level of physical fitness.

F. MILITARY SERVICE

12. The general application of the principle of selective service promises the most effective means for the placement of the individual in accordance with his capacity to serve national needs and with the least disturbance of basic social institutions.

13. The Selective Service System be requested to make adequate provision for the deferment of bona fide *premedical* students in colleges whose tentative admission to an approved medical school has already been assured on the basis of the completion of not less than two years.

14. The Selective Service System be requested to make similar provisions for the deferment of bona fide *predental* students in colleges whose tentative admission to an approved dental school has already been assured on the basis of the completion of not less than two years of college.

15. The Selective Service System be requested to make provision for the deferment of bona fide *pretheological* students in colleges or universities who have been approved by their appropriate ecclesiastical authority.

16. The Selective Service System be urged to issue a directive calling attention of state directors and local selective service boards to this need and the constant necessity of providing occupational deferment for selected individuals pursuing graduate work.¹³

The implementation of these recommendations, except for those on health and acceleration, could not be effected by the colleges and universities without both the cooperation of the

13. *Ibid.*, pp. 154 ff.

relevant government authorities and regulations issued by them. The situation six months after the first Baltimore Conference was described in a statement issued after a second Baltimore Conference held on July 15-16 and attended by small groups of approximately seventy-five officers from various types of institutions and organizations of higher education. After reaffirming the declarations of the first Conference, the statement read as follows

1. We deplore the continuing lack of any adequate, coordinated plan for the most effective utilization of higher education toward the winning of the war, and we urge the establishment of such a coordinated plan at the earliest possible moment.

2. The government is not utilizing institutions of higher education to capacity and is, therefore, impeding the flow of highly trained manpower essential to victory in a long war.

3. Through the provision of year-round instruction and many other recently adopted changes, higher education has demonstrated its readiness to devote all its facilities and energies to the war effort. However, the lack of any adequate, coordinated plan has given rise to widespread confusion among governmental agencies, educators, students, and the general public. This confusion constitutes a serious barrier to the full wartime utilization of higher education and hence to the successful prosecution of the war.

4. We believe that the full utilization of higher education is essential to the winning of a long total war because: (a) the war can be won only if a continuous flow of highly trained manpower is prepared for participation in the war effort; and (b) the institutions of higher education are the only institutions staffed and equipped to provide many essential types of advanced training.

5. To insure more effective utilization of the facilities of higher education through the establishment of a coordinated plan we recommend to the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Director of Selective Service System, and the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission that immediate steps be taken to assure effective and continuing cooperation between the agencies they represent and higher education.

6. Among the premises upon which such a coordinated plan should be based are the following:

- (a) the function of higher education is to provide the nation with broadly educated and highly trained men and women. This permanent function must be continuously performed lest the health, safety, and welfare of the nation be endan-

gered; but in the present grave crisis the winning of the war must have right of way in higher education as well as in all other national undertakings.

(b) To develop breadth of understanding, stamina, and qualities of leadership is a major function of higher education. These are essential characteristics of good officers in the Armed Forces. It is significant that although only 12 per cent of the men already inducted into selective service have had college training, 80 per cent of the men selected for officer training in the army have been chosen from this group of college men.

(c) The year-round instruction which has been established by colleges and universities to serve the war effort creates new financial problems for students. Present plans for the voluntary enlistment and training of college students provide only for those young men who can finance a college education or who can secure assistance without existing financial-aid programs. Large numbers of qualified young men are therefore barred from special types of training. Such a situation limits the supply of broadly educated officer material and denies to many young men equal opportunity for training. Economic status, race, or creed should not be allowed to restrict the training of adequate skilled manpower at the college level for the war program.

(d) Present plans for the enlistment and training of college students are inadequate also because (1) they fail to provide clearly defined avenues of training and service for those male students who are physically unqualified for military service but who are intellectually fitted to contribute to the winning of the war through industrial and other civilian pursuits, and (2) they fail to include women, who, as shown in other countries, have a vital part to play in the national effort.

(e) The institutions of higher education stand ready to make such further adaptations of their programs and facilities as may be necessary to meet the objectives set up by the federal agencies concerned with the training of college students for war service.

7. The proposed coordinated wartime plans for higher education should be established at once so that with the opening of the fall term in 1942 the institutions of higher education of the country can throw their entire resources into the war effort.

8. We recommend that the American Council on Education, which was established during the first World War to represent all the organizations of higher education, be recognized as the appropriate non-governmental agency to take such steps as may be necessary to implement the proposals herein stated and to serve in a continuous capacity for facilitating cooperation between higher education and government.¹⁴

Although a coordinated plan for the effective use of colleges and universities had not yet been evolved by the middle of 1942, some progress had been made. There were in existence the two organizations already mentioned—the National Committee on Education and Defense and the United States Office Wartime Commission which had a Divisional Committee on Higher Education; the National Defense Research Committee had been established; the National Roster of Scientific and Specialized Personnel had been created; short courses of college grade in engineering, science and management defense had been provided in colleges and universities; and accelerated programs had been introduced or their introduction was planned following the recommendations of the first Baltimore Conference.

Historically, the National Defense Research Council was the counterpart of the National Research Council established, under the National Academy of Sciences, by executive order of President Wilson in World War I as the channel through which the greater part of civilian scientific contribution to the war effort was made in 1917 and 1918. During the depression emergency President Roosevelt, in 1940, established the Science Advisory Board under the auspices of the National Academy of Sciences and the National Research Council "to handle problems of scientific operation and organization in the governmental bureaus which were referred to it by those in authority over the bureaus." In 1940 the National Defense Research Committee was established by President Roosevelt's executive order and was "charged with the duty of organizing research dealing with instrumentalities, materials, and mechanisms of warfare in fields which were not adequately covered by existing organizations such as the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics." There were

14. American Council on Education. *Higher Education and National Defense*, Bulletin No. 31, July 24, 1942.

thus three organizations—the National Academy of Sciences, the National Research Council, and the National Defense Research Committee—with overlapping membership engaged in advising the government or administering projects in the field of scientific research for defense.

The National Defense Research Committee consisted of Vannevar Bush, chairman, Conway Coe, James B. Conant, Frank B. Jewett, Richard C. Tolman, Karl T. Compton, and two high ranking officers of the Army and Navy respectively. The operations of the Committee were divided among four divisions: Communications and transportation; chemistry and chemical engineering; armor and armament; and detection devices and microwave radio, fire control, instruments, and infra-red radiation. Operating sections under each division, consisting of representatives of universities, engineering schools, and industry, formulated proposals and recommendations for research projects for the consideration of the main Committee. Upon favorable action, the Committee authorized contracts and appropriated funds for the prosecution of the project. Contracts were placed with industrial organizations or educational institutions or with individuals.¹⁵ In 1940-41 the Committee placed 269 contracts with 47 different universities and technical schools, and 153 contracts with 39 industrial laboratories. On June 28, 1941, the Committee was subordinated to the newly created Office of Scientific Research within the Office of Emergency Management with expanded functions, including:

Giving advice to the President with regard to the status of scientific and medical research; serving as a center for the mobilization of scientific personnel and resources; coordinating, aiding, and supplementing the research of government agencies; developing broad and coordinated plans for scientific research; initiating and supporting scientific research; and serving as a liaison for research with countries included within the framework of the Lend-Lease Act.¹⁶

15. See American Council on Education Studies. *Organizing Higher Education for National Defense* (Washington, D. C., 1941), pp. 16 ff.

16. American Council on Education Studies. *Higher Education Cooperates in National Defense* (Washington, D. C., 1941), p. 23.

The National Roster of Scientific and Specialized Personnel was established in 1940 to draw up a register of individuals of different qualifications to meet emergency needs in government service. The Roster was administered jointly by the United States Civil Service Commission and the National Resources Planning Board. The Roster cooperated with the Selective Service system and institutions of higher education, particularly in determining whether a registrant was a "necessary man" because specially trained in a field in which a shortage existed. The National Roster was represented by its chairman, Leonard Carmichael, on the National Committee on Professional Man Power, which was organized for two principal tasks: "first, to find out as quickly as possible the needs of highly trained men and women in defense fields; and second, to suggest the best procedures possible to meet these needs." The National Roster built up relationships with the National Defense Research Committee, the Office of Scientific Research and Development, the Office of Scientific Personnel, the American Medical Association, and the Procurement and Assignment Service of the Federal Security Agency. There was thus covered a variety of trained personnel in such fields as physics, mathematics, sciences in general, and medicine. Surveys were conducted "of the immediate needs of man power and woman power for the essential branches of national service" and of changing man power needs. The purpose of the National Roster cooperating with the other organizations was defined in the following statement by its chairman:

Any personnel needs disclosed by these surveys will be called to the attention of all government agencies, the Selective Service System, and defense industry, in order that, by planning, everything possible will be done to provide a continuous and adequate supply of men and women trained in technical and professional skills and in leadership to meet both immediate and long-range needs.¹⁷

TRAINING COURSES FOR SPECIFIC ACTIVITIES

Colleges and universities were called upon directly to provide training in specific fields for the defense and war efforts in October, 1940. The number of institutions utilized for this purpose,

17. American Council on Education Studies. *Higher Education and the War* (Washington, D. C., 1942), p. 111.

however, was never more than slightly over two hundred. In October, 1940, authorization was given for the provision in degree-granting colleges and universities of short courses in Engineering, Science and Management Defense Training (ESMDT). The purpose of these courses was "to meet the shortages of engineers, chemists, physicists, and production supervisors in fields essential to national defense." The general administration and supervision of the courses was placed in the hands of the United States Commissioner of Education, who was advised on policies and procedures by a National Advisory Committee consisting of representatives of the four fields concerned. The institutions selected to provide the short courses were required to draw up their own programs and to submit them for approval to the Commissioner of Education, who did not, however, have authority to direct the programs. The functions of the Office of Education were defined as follows in an address presented by Roy A. Seaton at the first Baltimore Conference:

A small central administrative staff in the Office of Education handles the general administration of the program; approves the plans and the proposals for individual courses; certifies the funds to the institutions; assists the institutions through its field staff in exploring the needs for courses and in organizing programs of study to meet those needs, and makes general over-all surveys of the needs of the defense agencies of the government and conveys information with respect to such needs to the institutions.¹⁸

The country was divided into twenty-two regions with a staff member, usually the president or dean of one of the participating institutions, in each region as adviser. The regional advisers conferred frequently with the Washington staff to exchange information, clarify procedures and policies, and help in the solution of each other's problems. In each region a committee was organized consisting of representatives from the participating institutions and of other agencies interested in or affected by the program, such as the United States Employment Service, the Civil Service Commission, state boards for vocational education, the Training Within Industry Branch of the Office of Production

18. American Council on Education Studies. *Higher Education and the War* (Washington, D. C., 1942), p. 64.

Management, labor supply committees, local defense committees, and other similar organizations. The function of each regional committee was "to explore the needs for defense training in its particular region and to organize programs of training in the institutions of the region for meeting these needs."

The colleges and universities could qualify for participation in the program if they gave at least eighteen semester hours or the equivalent of junior-senior major work in one or more of the four designated fields, but they were not expected to offer short courses in all of them. Participation was limited to public or tax-exempt degree-granting institutions. Funds provided under the Act authorizing the program could not be employed to equip additional colleges but could be used, up to 20 per cent of the sum allotted to each, for additional equipment. In other words, only such institutions as were already well equipped to give the relevant courses were eligible to participate in the program. They could, however, utilize the facilities of ineligible institutions, "provided that such facilities are more suitable or more economical than other facilities available to meet the need for training." Under this provision the facilities of the local industrial establishments were utilized.

To be admitted to the short courses students were required to be high school graduates as a minimum, which in some institutions was raised to several years of college work, college graduates, or holders of the Ph.D. degree. Women were eligible in all fields except one which was added later to train junior engineering aids in aircraft radio for the Signal Corps. The program was carried out in part-time and full-time courses; in practice the large majority of students took the courses as a form of in-service training; in 1943 this group rose to 87 per cent, an obvious indication of the interest of employers as well as of the shortages of trained personnel. Some courses were, in fact, established at the request of local industries. The participating institutions selected their own students, except for the Signal Corps course, for which candidates were selected by the Civil Service Commission. The students were given free tuition but had to provide for their own subsistence and the purchase of necessary supplies for their studies.

By the end of 1943 it was reported by the United States Office

of Education that the number of short courses offered was 12,500, distributed in 1,000 towns and cities and given in over 200 colleges. The students enrolled were distributed as follows: 356,000 in engineering; 14,000 in chemistry; 9,000 in physics; and 120,000 in production management; about 21 per cent of the students were women. The cost of the enterprise was about \$21,000,000 for the fiscal year. At the time of the report (January 20, 1944) more than 1,300,000 men and women had been trained, since the program had been launched in October, 1940, in short courses of twelve to sixteen weeks' duration. The aim of the short courses, whose designation was changed after the country entered the war to Engineering, Science, and Management War Training Program (ESMWT), was described as follows in the general summary which appeared in *Education for Victory*, issued by the United States Office of Education, of January 20, 1944 (p. 6):

While none of these programs has been intended to educate engineers, chemists, physicists, or production managers, they have been successful in meeting their established goals which are, first, to give professional engineers and scientists instruction in those specialties important to the national defense with which they have not had previous experience; second, to afford training which will make it possible for war production employees to prepare themselves for more difficult and responsible work assignments; and third, to enable men and women without previous technical training or experience to become assistants to fully qualified technical and managerial officers; and through training in fundamental techniques and principles, to function as subprofessional engineering, chemistry, physics, or management technicians.

ACCELERATION

Following recommendations from the United States Office of Education and the Baltimore Conference, Colleges and universities began early in 1942 to make adjustments to the situation imposed by the need for man power and by the Selective Service System through the introduction of accelerated programs. The recommendations on the subject made at the first Baltimore Conference are given on p. 138. On the basis of the following reasons, namely, that

It is important to retain as far as practicable a degree of uniformity among colleges and universities in such matters as calendar changes and credits, while making adjustments in the interests of acceleration. Recognizing the increasing demand for men and women trained in technical skills and in professions essential to total war and the consequent need for preparing them for such service at the earliest possible time and further recognizing that basic education should be completed prior to induction through Selective Service at the age of 20,¹⁹

the Conference recommended all institutions of higher education to consider ways and means for acceleration, the needed adjustment of curricula without lowering the standards of admission, and desirable articulation of calendars of secondary schools and colleges to facilitate acceleration of the total educational program.

Returns from one thousand colleges and universities, reported in *Education for Victory* for May 15, 1942, showed that a four quarter plan had been adopted in 178 institutions; a three quarter or term plan in 137; three semesters in 28; two semesters or terms plus a 12-week summer session in 157; and elimination of the spring vacation in 275 institutions. These plans not only involved a forty-eight week year in most cases but also a six-day week of instruction. The general result was to make graduation possible in two and two-thirds or in three years.

In June, 1942, the Council on Medical Education and Hospitals of the American Medical Association, the Association of Medical Colleges, and the Federation of State Medical Boards of the United States approved acceleration in medical education provided the quality of instruction was protected. Of the medical schools, forty-nine adopted accelerated programs under which students were accepted and a class graduated every nine months, and eleven schools graduated classes at the same intervals but admitted entering classes once a year. The general length of medical preparation was reduced to three years.

By the middle of 1942 a nation-wide pattern of accelerated programs had been developed which made earlier graduation possible. It was reported that students devoted more serious attention to studies and less to extracurricular activities. In all cases,

19. American Council on Education Studies. *Higher Education and the War* (Washington, D. C., 1942), p. 156.

special emphasis was placed upon wartime needs and training for physical fitness. Nevertheless, the system involved hardships for both students and faculty members; for students who in many cases had made their financial plans for a normal academic year and depended upon their earnings during vacations; for faculty members whose teaching load was increased with little or no increase in their salaries. Institutional budgets were also affected by additional costs involved for maintenance, supplies, and custodial care.

Changes in college calendars produced the necessity of articulation with secondary schools. The policy generally adopted was that acceleration in secondary schools should not be compulsory, but that each case should be considered individually on the basis of physical, social, and intellectual maturity. It was recommended, for example, in *Education for Victory*, April 15, 1942, that high school reports to colleges should include:

(1) A description of the student, indicating qualities of character, habits of work, personality, and social adjustment. (2) The results of the use of instruments of evaluation by the schools:—
 (a) Such standardized tests as are applicable to the school's work.
 (b) Other types of tests appropriate to the objectives of the school.
 (c) Scholastic aptitude tests that measure characteristics essential to college work and are independent of particular patterns of school preparation.

The Association of American Colleges adopted a resolution in December, 1942, recommending the admission by means of tests and reports of high school students not yet graduated. The Educational Policies Commission of the National Education Association a few months later passed the following resolution:

We urge that, during the war emergency, selected students who have achieved senior standing in high school and who will in the judgment of the high-school and college authorities, profit from a year's college education before they reach selective service age, be admitted to college and, at the end of the successful completion of their freshman year, be granted a diploma of graduation by the high school and full credit for a year's work towards the fulfillment of the requirements for the bachelor's degree or as preparation for advanced professional education.²⁰

20. Quoted in *Education for Victory*, June 15, 1943, p. 10.

The whole question of the acceleration of secondary school pupils into college was given careful consideration by the leading accrediting associations of the country. There was general agreement that desirable educational standards should be maintained, that "unrestricted admission to college of students who have not completed the secondary school program cannot be justified on educational grounds;" that each case should be considered on its individual merits, having regard to age, social and physical maturity, and scholastic standing in the senior year of high school; and that the usual data on credits earned in high school should be supplemented with information collected through the employment of other measures of educational growth. It was urged that close cooperation be established between the appropriate guidance officers of the secondary schools and colleges concerned, and that proper guidance and direction be provided the students admitted to the colleges.²¹ The whole issue ceased to have any importance, however, when the Selective Service age was lowered to eighteen in November, 1942, and the Army and Navy Specialized Training Programs were introduced a few months later.

ARMY AND NAVY SPECIALIZED TRAINING PROGRAMS

The lowering of the draft age to eighteen served to increase the difficulties of the colleges in particular. It meant that only a small number of students, liable to Selective Service, could enter college; and for only a minority of these could deferment be claimed as "potentially necessary men." The recommendations on deferment ceased to be applicable in the majority of cases, and even then could only be considered for students at the end of the first semester of their freshman year. After August, 1942, it appeared from negotiations which were then proceeding that plans were being formulated to relieve colleges and students of the prevailing uncertainties. Such plans were finally issued on December 12, 1942, by the War and Navy Departments and were based on consultation with the staff of the War Manpower Commission, the Navy Advisory Council on Education and the Committee of the American Council on Education on Relationships of Higher Education to Federal Government, formed in August,

21. *Ibid.*, p. 10 f.

1942. It had been hoped that over-all plans would be formulated for the utilization of colleges and universities in the training of men for the Army, Navy, war industry, and essential civilian services. When published, the plans dealt only with the education of selected enlisted men for specialized training to meet the needs of the Army and Navy.

The plans were determined by the need of larger numbers of men requiring specialized educational and technical training to meet the demand of mechanical warfare and the steadily growing forces in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard. To this end the resources of colleges and universities were to be utilized to the maximum extent. Selected candidates were to be placed on active duty, be in uniform, receive pay, and be under military discipline, while the selected institutions were to provide instruction in curricula prescribed by the services, and furnish the necessary housing and messing facilities. The colleges and universities were to be selected on the basis of their ability to provide the necessary instructional and other facilities under rules and regulations prescribed by the War Manpower Commission after consultation with the Secretaries of War and the Navy. The institutions were to be selected by a joint committee of nine representatives, three each from the Army, Navy, and the War Manpower Commission. The plans of the Army and Navy were to be the same in fundamentals, with such variations as would be necessitated by the needs of each Service.

The objective of the Army Specialized Training Program (ASTP) was to meet the need of the Army for the specialized technical training of soldiers on active duty for certain army tasks for which its own training facilities were insufficient in extent or character. To provide such training for selected soldiers, the Army would enter into contracts with selected colleges and universities for the use of their facilities and faculties. The selection of qualified young men would be on a broad democratic basis without regard to financial resources.

The selection of soldiers for ASTP training was to be made from enlisted men who had completed their basic military training and applied for selection. The plan for the selection, limited to men under twenty-two, was to be the same as for the selection of enlisted men for Officer Candidate Schools, with such addi-

tional methods of ascertaining qualifications as might be deemed appropriate after consultation with the American Council on Education. The methods were to include such tests as would reasonably assure that the selected individual was intellectually, temperamentally, psychologically, and educationally capable of attaining standards of academic proficiency which were to be formulated for the course of training.

In the selection of institutions, specific consideration was to be given to (1) standards and equipment for the required instruction; (2) adequacy of housing and messing facilities; and (3) minimum army overhead. Curricula for the specialized training needed for the various Services were to be prepared in consultation with the American Council on Education, and, varying with the nature of the tasks for which training would be provided, the curricula would call for varying lengths of the period of training. They would also vary according to the stages—basic or advanced—in any particular course of training. At the termination of specialized training, whether as a result of screening or the completion of a course, the soldier would be (1) selected for further training in an Officer Candidate School; (2) recommended for a technical noncommissioned officer; (3) returned to the troops; (4) in exceptional cases, detailed for very advanced technical training; and (5) in very exceptional cases, be made available for technical work to be done out of the Army but deemed to be highly important to the war effort.

The Navy College Training Program (NCTP) was virtually the same in principle as that of the ASTP, but differed in the specific provisions as result of differences in the types of services to which training was to be directed. The plan was intended "to permit selection of the country's best qualified young men on a broad democratic basis, without regard to financial resources, and thus permit the Navy to induct and train young men of superior ability for officers and specialists." High school graduates or students having equivalent formal education who attained their seventeenth but not their twentieth birthdays at the time of enlistment or induction were to be eligible for selection for the program. Enlisted or inducted men between the ages of seventeen and twenty-three were to be eligible to apply for the program if recommended by their commanding officers. Suc-

cessful candidates were to be permitted to indicate their preferences as to the colleges to which they wished to be assigned, and to express a preliminary choice of the branch of service—Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, but final assignment was based on demonstrated ability and counseling during the first two semesters. The same procedures were to be followed in the selection of institutions and prescription of curricula as for the ASTP. On completion of college training all students were to be assigned to the appropriate specialized training in the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard.

The first task that had to be undertaken under the plans for the ASTP and NCTP was the selection of the institutions possessing the necessary facilities to carry out the programs of training. This task was performed by the joint committee of nine. The first list of selected institutions was published on February 6, 1943, and included 281 institutions—249 for the ASTP and 51 for the NCTP; of these 19 were used for both programs. The principles of the contracts entered into with a selected institution were that the institution should be left in no worse position by reason of the use made of its facilities for the training program. According to a statement approved by the Joint Army and Navy Board for Training Unit Contracts, "this does not mean that *all* of the institutions will be maintained by the program, nor that the total over-all costs will be prorated on the basis of the ratio of service trainees and civilian students." Payments were made on a "budgeted cost basis," that is, "upon a budget of expected costs predicated upon current (latest fiscal report) facts of operation, reviewed at sufficiently frequent intervals as to permit such adjustments as will correct differences between estimated costs and actual costs."

In addition to the provision of the particular type of training contracted for, an institution was expected to provide supplementary services, such as personnel and guidance services; facilities for medical care and physical education instruction under general regulations and supervision of the War and Navy Departments; provision of religious services; and recreational activities.

The curricula for the ASTP were prepared by panels of national authorities in each field recommended by the United

States Office of Education and the American Council on Education, those for the NCTP were prepared by the Navy's Advisory Committee on Education and special consultants from colleges and universities. Both included educational programs and programs to meet the special needs of the respective Services. The basic program for the ASTP included college mathematics, physics, and chemistry; the advanced programs included work in such fields as the premedical and medical, pre dental and dental, preveterinary and veterinary, all branches of engineering, and special courses in mathematics, physics, chemistry, area studies, and personnel psychology.²² Each program was organized in a series of twelve-week terms, varying in number according to the requirements of the respective field of training. The weekly schedule included approximately 24 hours of class and laboratory; 24 hours of preparation and study; 6 hours of physical conditioning; and 5 hours of military instruction.

The NSTCP curricula provided the same courses for all students in the first two sixteen-week terms or the equivalent and emphasized fundamental college work in mathematics, science, English, drawing, and physical training, and instruction up to three class hours per week in naval organization and general naval orientation.

Although the details of the plans for the ASTP and NCTP were published on December 12, 1942, and lists of selected institutions began to be issued in the following February, the assignment of students was so long delayed that it was feared that the program would not be in full operation until January 1, 1944. The Army-Navy test for the selection of high school students throughout the country was held on April 12, 1943, but it was feared that their assignment to colleges and universities would not be made for some time. The situation was clearly described by Dr. Edmund E. Day, chairman of the Committee on Relationships of Higher Education to the Federal Government in a letter to Secretary Stimson, dated April 10, 1943, in which he wrote:

The Committee on Relationships of Higher Education to the Federal Government ventures to express its deep concern with the present status and apparent prospects of the major section of the Army Specialized Training Program. The testimony from educa-

22. See Chapter VI for a discussion of the Intensive Language Program.

tional institutions throughout the country reveals the great difficulties under which the program is operating. Evidence accumulates that under present procedures it will continue to be extremely difficult to secure an adequate number of competent men from those now in the armed forces. The colleges have been selected and many of them notified of the part they are to pay in the Army Specialized Training Program. Many of them have retained or even assembled staffs and have made arrangements for plant facilities adequate to take care of the proposed training.

The Committee recommended that selected high school graduates be assigned immediately to colleges and universities for training. Such a proposal implied a departure from the existing plans requiring thirteen weeks' basic military training before assignment, a departure which the Army authorities refused to sanction. The program did get under way by the middle of the year, and on October 1, 1943, the situation was as indicated in the following table:²³

Program	Number of Institutions	Number of Trainees
Army Specialized Training	216	129,080
Army Air Forces	151	66,512
Navy College Training	244	9,193
Navy Air Force	17	7,743
Total	628	212,528
Total number of institutions, eliminating duplication, 440		

The peak was reached in December, 1943, when 380,000 trainees were enrolled for specialized training in 489 institutions. The numbers then began to be reduced until the basic phase of the ASTP was terminated in April, 1944, and the other programs a few months later. The place of the ASTP was taken by the Army Specialized Training Reserve Program (ASTRP), which had been begun on August 9, 1943.

THE RECORD OF THE WAR YEARS

The story of the relationships between the Federal government and the institutions of higher education in the country in the

23. American Council on Education. *Higher Education and National Defense*, Bulletin No. 61, December 9, 1943.

years immediately preceding and during the war is one of confusion and uncertainty. The blame for this situation does not rest with the colleges and universities or with its representative organizations—the American Council on Education, the Association of American Colleges—or the division of higher education of the Wartime Commission of the United States Office of Education, or the committee appointed by this office in the middle of 1942, with Dr. W. H. Cowley as chairman. The cynic may say that the institutions and organizations were animated by selfish interests. The cynic nevertheless would be wrong. The records of the deliberations and recommendations, particularly of the American Council on Education and its special committees, furnish convincing evidence that they were inspired by concern for the national interests both for the winning of the war and for the future of the country in the years to follow the war. Even before the following statement was published, they had recognized the need of an over-all plan which was implied in the pronouncement issued by the War Manpower Commission on August 19, 1942, and which read as follows:

All able-bodied male students are destined for the armed forces. The responsibility for determining the specific training for such students is a function of the Army and Navy.

For those students, men and women, who are not to serve in the armed forces there should be developed through the War Manpower Commission plans of guidance which will help the students where they can make the most effective contribution to the war effort, including essential supporting activities. The War Manpower Commission should also make plans for the instruction of those for whom further training is necessary to enable them according to their qualifications to make their most needed contributions to the support of the armed forces.²⁴

It was inferred from this statement that an over-all plan would be developed, which would make possible the fullest utilization of the resources of colleges and universities and training for civilian needs in the war effort as well as for the armed force. Instead, piecemeal plans were made—for an Enlisted Training Corps, for the ESMWT, for a pilot training program under the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and for specialized research—

24. Quoted in *The Education Record*, July, 1943, p. 192.

each of them important but together not constituting an over-all blueprint which would have relieved the colleges and universities of their uncertainties. There was, of course, one justification for the failure to develop an over-all plan, and that was the difficulty of anticipating the needs of the armed services under war conditions which were constantly fluctuating. It may be argued that criticism after the event is easy, but the records provide ample evidence to prove that vision and insight were not lacking on the part of the leaders in institutions of higher education.²⁵

The critical situation that threatened higher education was recognized from the start by those directly charged with its administration and became a matter of grave concern during the war years. It was not until 1944, however, that the situation was brought to the attention of Congress, and not until 1945 that an inquiry was actually undertaken. On June 21, 1944, the House of Representatives unanimously approved a resolution (House Resolution 592, 78th Congress) introduced by Representative McCormick; the resolution was renewed on January 8, 1945 (House Resolution 63, 79th Congress). The original resolution authorized the Committee on Education (the Honorable Graham A. Barden, chairman)

(a) To make a study of the effect upon colleges and universities throughout the United States of (1) reduction in enrollment and faculties as a result of service by students and faculty members in the armed forces of the United States or in other war activities, and (2) recent curtailment and prospective further curtailment of Army and Navy training programs in such colleges and universities; with a view to determining means by which such effects may be alleviated.

(b) To formulate, as soon as possible, for the consideration by the House, such legislation as the Committee deems appropriate for alleviating such effects.²⁶

25. See the files of the American Council on Education's *Higher Education and National Defense*; and George F. Zook, "The President's Annual Report," and Carter Davidson, "Blueprints on Trial and Error in College Wartime Program?" in *The Educational Record*, July, 1943.

26. *Effect of Certain War Activities Upon Colleges and Universities*. Report from the Committee on Education, House of Representatives. (Washington, D. C., 1945). House Report No. 214, p. 15. The discussion

An advisory committee, representing the various types of higher educational institutions, was appointed in 1944 with Dr. Francis J. Brown as director of the investigation. The study revealed only what was already well-known—a serious dislocation of “one of the basic forces in American life—the colleges and universities”; the efforts of these institutions to adjust themselves to the emergency created by the transfer of approximately three-fourths of their men students into military service; and the threat of the collapse of many of them from the prolongation of the war beyond the winter of 1944-45. That the problem affected the whole national interest and welfare was clearly brought out in the following passage:

Serious as this situation may be from the standpoint of individual institutions, it may develop into a national crisis by drying up certain of the sources from which streams of mental power have flowed into every phase of our common life throughout the years and during the present war. Furthermore, we cannot ignore the fact that returning veterans, both now and after the close of the war, will expect to find colleges and universities available from which they can secure the education which the Government has generously provided for and which they need for peacetime pursuits. In addition, America will turn to its institutions of higher education to replenish its supply of scientific and professional men, and to furnish a broad understanding of economic, social, and international matters in order to meet the complex problems of the post-war world.²⁷

Colleges and universities had contributed extensively to the war effort—a majority of the officers in the armed forces, a highly trained personnel to the Medical Corps, scientists trained for research work in all aspects demanded by the war and the war effort, chaplains for the armed forces and civilian clergymen who upheld civilian morale, experts in the various phases of international relations, teachers in schools and colleges, the leaders in the unprecedented conversion of peacetime to wartime in-

of the effect of the war on higher education is based on this Report. See also “Higher Education and the War,” *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, January, 1944.

27. *Ibid.*, p. 12.

dustries, and young men and women trained in the specialized war-training programs.

The effect of the war upon the finances, enrollments, and instructional staffs of the colleges and universities varied with the opportunities for engaging in activities directly contributing to the war effort through specialized training and research. The larger institutions, because they had the necessary facilities, were not as seriously affected as the smaller institutions; while women's colleges were able to maintain almost normal enrollments. On the financial side, the majority of the institutions were able to balance their budgets through the first three years of the war, but generally this was made possible through the absence of faculty members in military, government, or other war service and through the reduction of the salaries of those who remained. The enrollment of civilian students in all of the higher educational institutions of the country in 1943-44 and 1944-45 was 54 per cent of what it had been in 1939-40. The average, however, does not tell the story of the uneven distribution of the enrollment, which in some men's colleges and teachers colleges fell to only 10 per cent of the 1939-40 enrollment. The number of faculty members declined in 1943-44 to 97 per cent, and in 1944-45 to 90 per cent of the number in 1939-40; while the number of men decreased to 92 per cent in 1943-44 and to 84 per cent in 1944-45, the number of women increased to 110 per cent in 1943-44 and to 108 per cent in 1944-45 as compared with 1939-40, as a result of replacement of men by women teachers. The decline in the number of faculty members was not as great as the student enrollment, because they were retained to teach both civilian and noncivilian students.

On the financial status of colleges and universities the effect varied with the types of institutions. The reduction of income from student fees was not as serious, for example, in publicly supported institutions as in private institutions. In the 702 institutions that replied to the questionnaires sent out by Dr. Brown, income from this source was 67 per cent in 1943-44 and 64 per cent in 1944-45 as compared with 1939-40. Army and Navy contracts in 1943-44 accounted for 50 per cent or more of the income of certain men's colleges, and to a lesser but still substantial amount in many coeducational institutions. The cur-

tailment of the specialized training programs had a serious effect on the income of the colleges and universities concerned in 1944-45. Income from other sources, such as grants for the ESMWT courses or for research under the control of the Office of Scientific Research and Development, while important to the institutions receiving it, was unevenly distributed. Thus, of the 105 institutions participating in the research program, eight alone were allotted 90 per cent of the funds. The only reasonably stable source of income was derived from federal and state funds by publicly maintained institutions.

The financial situation was further aggravated by the increase in expenditures for current operations. This was due to a number of causes: increase in the year-round teaching load consequent on acceleration; competition with government employment and wages paid in industry; rise in the cost of living; and increased personal taxes. The total expenditures for educational and general purposes in 713 institutions that reported for 1943-44 and 1944-45 (estimated) were 126 per cent and 115 per cent of the base year 1939-40. Institutions with military programs showed a greater increase for 1943-44 over 1939-40 than institutions without such programs. The average increases in expenditures for instruction for 1943-44 and 1944-45 (estimated) were 110 per cent and 104 per cent as compared with 1939-40. Efforts were made to meet the situation by adjustments and economies which only served to pile up an accumulation of deferred needs, with serious results on the continuous effective operation of the colleges and universities. Faculty members were granted or were encouraged to seek leaves of absence for service in the armed forces, government, and war industries and were not replaced; or else their places were filled by part-time instructors and temporary appointees of lesser training and teaching experience than usually required. If they were not replaced, their remaining colleagues were assigned to give their courses even though they were not in their own fields of specialization. Other adjustments and economies were effected by reducing the number of courses, and consequently the opportunities for students to choose their courses. In many instances appropriations for library and health services were reduced, as well as expenditures for replacement and repair of permanent equipment and

physical plant. Special drives for funds, the use of unrestricted endowment funds or of funds set aside for buildings or other current needs, and loans from banks and other sources to meet payrolls and other costs of operation were methods employed to make the financial adjustments. The accumulation of these effects of the war is described as follows:

In view of these circumstances, and (1) the prospect of eventually larger demands on institutions of higher education when demobilization is under way; (2) the rapidly growing shortage of qualified teachers, especially in the technical and scientific fields; (3) the demand that will be made by government, industry, and institutions of higher education for highly trained research workers in the natural and social sciences; and (4) the greatly increased responsibility that is expected of colleges and universities by local and regional areas as well as society as a whole to provide a far greater measure of adult education in many forms, college officials wonder whether their institutions will be even reasonably well equipped from the point of view of personnel, plant, and equipment to meet the postwar educational needs of the country.

Colleges and universities must be ready to meet the unprecedented demand made by the increase in the number of students. Existing facilities for higher education will prove inadequate for the task. The number of veterans and war workers who will go to colleges and universities will remain small during the period of high war production. When reconversion begins, and progressively in proportion to the resulting unemployment, the numbers will increase. Institutions of higher education should be maintained in such condition that they may meet financial and other contingencies.²⁸

The Committee made the following recommendations: (1) The reestablishment of student deferment for those majoring in fields which are essential to the national welfare and for which extended periods of training are necessary, such as medicine, dentistry, engineering, physics, chemistry, divinity, and others. (2) Preferential discharge of former students preparing in fields essential to the national welfare. (3) Deferment of faculty members teaching in essential fields to meet the educational needs of veterans and others. (4) Giving priority in release from military

28. *Ibid.*, pp. 31 f.

duty or other government positions for faculty members whose services are requested by institutions of higher education. (5) Facilities for the acquisition by higher educational institutions, by gift or purchase, of surplus commodities no longer needed by the armed forces or other government agencies. (6) Increased exemptions for gifts to higher educational institutions in the provisions of corporation and individual income tax laws. (7) The appointment of a nonpartisan Commission on Emergency Federal Aid to Higher Educational Institutions to look into the whole question of federal contracts and the financial status of higher educational institutions and to consider methods for allocating contracts, for which Congress should appropriate a sum of \$25,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1945. (8) Grants-in-aid to higher educational institutions for repair or replacement of permanent equipment and repairing or remodeling and construction of buildings, if provision were made by Congress for a program of public works. (9) The establishment or designation by Congress of a federal research agency directed to use, on a contractual basis, higher educational institutions for developing and conducting of research and the training of research workers. (10) The preparation by a committee representing educational institutions and the armed services of a unified plan, to be revised periodically, for effective utilization of colleges and universities in declared emergencies. And (11) the appointment by the Committee on Education and Labor of the Senate and the Committee on Education of the House of Representatives of an advisory committee representing all phases and levels of education to assist them, on request, in the formulation of needed legislation.²⁹

To carry out the seventh of these recommendations the Barden Bill (H.R. 3116) was introduced on May 3, 1945, for the reason stated in Section 1 of the bill:

The Congress recognizes that the present war has already caused impairment of the effectiveness of higher educational institutions in the United States, and it is the purpose of this Act to provide for compensating in part for this impairment and to prevent the present crisis in higher educational institutions from becoming so acute as to undermine seriously the whole structure of higher education.

29. *Ibid*, pp. 7 ff.

The bill proposed the creation of a Commission on Emergency Aid to Higher Educational Institutions, consisting of seven members, to administer an emergency fund of \$25,000,000 to be disbursed through contracts for stand-by and other services. The award of contracts was to be determined on the basis of a review of the financial status of the institutions applying for aid. The need of such aid would be presumed to exist when full-time resident enrollment, military and civilian, of an institution dropped for three consecutive quarters or two semesters below 60 per cent of the average enrollment for the academic years 1937 to 1940. The amount of contract was to be computed on the basis of loss of income from student fees resulting from the drop in enrollment below 60 per cent of the base years. The whole program was to be for the emergency only and aid was to cease within six months after the cessation of war. Nothing further was heard of the bill after several Committee hearings.

The future of higher education continued to be a matter of grave concern even after the veterans began to return to the colleges and universities in constantly increasing numbers. On July 13, 1946, President Truman appointed the President's Commission on Higher Education to "re-examine our system of higher education in terms of its objectives, methods, and facilities, and in the light of the social role it has to play," and to examine "the functions of higher education in our democracy and of the means by which they can best be performed." In appointing the Commission, President Truman expressed confidence that "the combined efforts of the educational institutions, the States, and the Federal Government will succeed in solving the immediate problems." The questions to be considered by the Commission included: "Ways and means of expanding educational opportunities for all able young people; the adequacy of curricula, particularly in the fields of international affairs and social understanding; the desirability of establishing a series of intermediate technical institutes; the financial structure of higher education with particular reference to the requirements for the rapid expansion of physical facilities." The Commission's inquiry, however, was not limited to these questions.

Dr. George F. Zook, president of the American Council on Education, was appointed chairman; and Dr. Francis J. Brown,

Staff Associate of the Council, executive secretary of the Commission; Dr. John R. Steelman, director of War Mobilization and Reconversion, was designated as liaison officer between the Commission and the executive agencies to coordinate their work. The Commission, consisting of thirty members representing civic and educational interests, held its first meeting on July 29-30 in Washington, D. C. and identified the following major areas for the future work of the Commission: (1) The responsibilities of higher education in our democracy and in international affairs. (2) Ways and means of providing higher educational opportunity for all in terms of the needs of the individual and of the nation. (3) The organization and expansion of higher education. (4) Financing higher education. And (5) Providing personnel for higher education.³⁰

HIGHER EDUCATION OF WOMEN AND THE WAR

Colleges and universities for women were not as seriously affected by the war as were the colleges and universities for men. Their problems were not concerned so much with enrollments and financial conditions as they were with advising and counseling students on types of activities and services in which they could be most useful, first in national defense and later for the war effort. In 1943-44 the enrollment of women in colleges and universities was 88.3 per cent, and in 1944-45 rose to 93.1 per cent of the base figures in 1939-40. The most serious decline took place in teachers colleges, where the enrollment was 67.1 per cent in 1943-44 and 69.4 per cent in 1944-45; and in the normal schools, where the decrease was far more significant and fell to 51.6 per cent in 1943-44 and 46.6 per cent in 1944-45, as compared, in both cases, with the enrollment in 1939-40. Taking colleges, universities, and professional schools alone, the enrollment in 1943-44 was 95.3 per cent and 101.4 per cent in 1944-45, using the same basis for comparison.

For some time after the state of emergency was announced, the leaders in the field of higher education for women were faced with the difficulty of making adjustments because of in-

30. See United States Office of Education, *Higher Education*, September 2, 1946, pp. 1 f.

The Commission published its report in six volumes at the end of 1947.

ability to determine the national demands for the services of college trained women. Accordingly, the principle was adopted that education is national defense; later, that education is *war training*, and that women who continued their general education were preparing themselves for long-time service. In reporting for the section on Women in Colleges at the conference called by the National Committee on Education and Defense of the American Council on Education, held in Washington, D. C., on February 6, 1941, President Meta Glass stated that:

The Committee emphasized the need for the liberal arts colleges to continue to give the fundamental liberal arts education. They should keep on with this ancient work of intellectual discipline and enlightenment, but do it even better than in the past. Should the stream of youth passing through this discipline be stopped, the nation will lack in the future a sufficient number of workers in the vitally important professions which need the foundation of college training, and will lack also citizens with knowledge, vision, understanding, and power of leadership.

The Committee recognized that colleges would wish also to turn their students to ways of useful service for the present needs of their country. In suggesting lines of service, colleges should point to the students the importance of using the training they have had and of preferably choosing fields of work where their education can count instead of turning, short of demonstrated need, to manual labor. They noted that services of both immediate and long-range value have to do with intelligent and devoted citizenship. Ability for such service is fostered by everything that develops knowledge, understanding, disciplined emotions, and wills; everything that leads to reasoned and unfrightened adjustment to change; and everything that contributes to making persons able to guide others in these paths. Students now in college will spend the larger part of their lives in forming and carrying on a new order. As they strengthen their country in defense they will be training themselves in this long-time service. . . .

The session came to a close with an understanding that women in colleges must be fitting themselves to carry on their usual work in society, prepare themselves also in some generally useful skills more needed in defense than normally, and await the proper time for entrance into work normally done by the men of the country in accordance with calls put upon them by the government. Their

present defense activities are preinduction orientation to their part in selective service.³¹

The fundamental aim of education was not lost sight of during the next few years. Thus a "Survey of War Training Programs for Women in Colleges and Universities," published in 1943 by the Committee on College Women Students and the War, which was created in 1940 as one of the subcommittees of the National Committee on Education and Defense of the American Council on Education, concluded with the following words:

The Committee recognizes that no general pattern for colleges and universities enrolling women students can or should be laid down. Each institution should make only such adaptation as its own facilities and local need make desirable. Initiative and resourcefulness are prime requisites in order that colleges may give such education as shall make it possible for its students to render maximum service to war and yet, at the same time, be prepared for effective living in the postwar world.³²

Between the dates of the two quotations circumstances changed as the students themselves began to manifest a strong desire to make a contribution to the national interest and welfare and as the demand for the services of women began to increase progressively in the armed forces (the Women's Army Auxiliary Corps—WAAC, Women's Reserve of the Naval Reserve—WAVES, Women's Reserve of the Coast Guard—SPARS, and Marines), in government services, in industry, and in community activities. Since these demands were not exclusively for women college students or graduates, but created important opportunities for them, it was not felt that it was either necessary or desirable to change the programs of the women's colleges and universities generally. It was, however, decided that new emphases were needed in the existing courses.

The Committee on Women in College and Defense undertook and continued as its major task the study of the extent and types of demands for the services of women that were developing and

31. American Council on Education Studies. *Organizing Education for National Defense* (Washington, D. C., 1941), pp. 60, 62.

32. American Council on Education. *Higher Education and National Defense*, Bulletin No. 53, May 6, 1943.

disseminated the information as it was gathered to the colleges and universities as the basis for advising and counseling students. After the United States had entered the war, the women's colleges and universities recognized that the programs of acceleration must be adopted if women were to engage in further specialized training. At first acceleration was achieved by giving credit to students who attend summer sessions for eight or twelve weeks; later the majority of the women's institutions adopted the same plans as the institutions for men. The demand for women's services began to make itself felt early in 1942 for work as junior draftsmen; as chemists for testing materials and for all kinds of analysis; as physicists and mathematicians; as accountants, statisticians, and economists; as stenographers, typists, and secretaries; for pretraining in the air force; and particularly as nurses.

The occupational opportunities continued to expand in other directions—in the health fields, in diplomatic services and special investigation, in scientific research, in business and industry, and in schools and colleges. At the same time, there was the continuing opportunity for community services, for voluntary activities, for training in health and physical fitness, and for a great variety of activities for the maintenance and preservation of morale. These, it was considered, could be provided for in extra-curricular organizations or in short courses open to the students and public alike. By October, 1942, a change could be noted, as was indicated in the following passages from a report of the Committee on College Women Students and the War:

College women will be needed at the earliest possible moment—are needed now—in many fields to meet the emergency resulting from the increasing shortage of manpower on the technical and professional level. The year-round program must be continued—regardless of the absence of Federal aid—and made equally available to all students. Women as well as men should be urged to assume their responsibility for preparing themselves for employment at the earliest possible time.

To a much greater degree than for men, colleges and universities have tended to retain the "education as usual" attitude for women students. Large numbers of women are still continuing to major in the arts and humanities. These are vital in the total cultural pattern

and will be preserved, but *only* if the war is won. In 1942-43 knowledge of the sciences, of mathematics, and of social studies are vitally important for the effective participation of college women in the war program and must temporarily take first place.

As every able-bodied man is "destined for the armed forces," so every able-bodied woman should likewise sense the obligation to enter some form of war service—in the necessary social service fields such as nursing or teaching, in industry, or in the Armed Forces. To continue to pursue cultural subjects may leave the individual unprepared for effective participation in any of these fields. To shift to subjects definitely leading to essential occupations may enable the college women to find employment in the type of position where her ability can be utilized effectively.

Many women students still think in terms of a leisurely four-year course. Production cannot wait. It should be emphasized that under present conditions, women students should plan their individual programs to equip them to fill a position at the end of any semester in case the crisis becomes so acute that the national interest demands their services.³³

At the beginning of 1943 the Committee on College Women Students and the War issued "A Statement of Policy for Colleges of Arts and Sciences." The statement expressed the Committee's belief that the basic curricula were essential in the national crisis, and that the courses normally given could produce workers immediately useful in the following fields: chemists, mathematicians, physicists, statisticians, economists, research workers, administrative assistants, psychologists, and bacteriologists, as well as linguists, geologists, and geographers. Further, the colleges could provide the necessary foundations for professional training in the most urgently needed professions: medicine, the nine responsible positions in nursing; engineering, social welfare including a great variety of services, such as child care, important for the war effort, and teaching. The basic courses essential for all or most of these activities included: English, mathematics, chemistry, physics, biology, foreign languages, history, government, economics, sociology, and psychology. Many institutions combined liberal arts and sciences with technical or professional training for social work, physical education,

33. *Ibid.*, Bulletin No. 35, October 17, 1942.

home economics, or secretarial work. The Committee recommended acceleration of the graduation of good students under guidance and advice. The importance of developing qualities of mind and character, adaptability and leadership, greatly in demand for many phases of the war effort—uniformed, government, industrial, and social services—was emphasized. Colleges were urged to devote special attention to the adequate counseling of students so that each individual student's abilities might be used where they will count most in the war effort.³⁴

The Committee continued to provide information on the greatly expanded needs and opportunities for women. Some colleges organized "war majors" in mathematics, physics, chemistry, biology, bacteriology, and home economics; or "war minors" as electives to prepare for a great variety of occupations, some of which, particularly in engineering and allied fields, had not been open to women before the war. A few institutions established emergency short courses of one, two, three, or four semesters, leading to immediate service in shortage areas—such as accounting, aeronautics, day nursery teaching, dental hygiene, dietetics, engineering fundamentals, engineering inspection, meteorology, foreign service, laboratory aid, language, map reading, medical entomology, medical secretarial training, military training for students intending to enter the armed services, recreational leadership, secretarial work, and statistics. Provision was everywhere made for sound physical fitness programs and extracurricular programs in Red Cross training in first aid, home nursing, nutrition, motor mechanics, canteen work, and surgical dressings. These activities were found to be of real psychological value, in helping young people to recognize the community needs and in the actual training offered; but it was suggested that they should not be considered important enough to constitute a war-training program.³⁵

From the middle of 1943, the colleges and universities for women had made their adjustments. There were definitely recognized fundamental principles; each institution, however, had to make its own adjustments in accordance with the interests of their students, the local community needs, and the variety of

34. *Ibid.*, Bulletin No. 44, January 23, 1943.

35. *Ibid.*, Bulletin No. 53, May 6, 1943.

opportunities for service afforded in each locality. But, although there was no uniform concerted plan or program, there was also an absence of that bewilderment and confusion which prevailed in the corresponding institutions for men, dependent upon directives from government. It is interesting that in the continuing reports on higher education, issued by the American Council on Education during the national defense and war years, no reports appear on problems or activities in women's colleges and universities after May 6, 1943. The situation at that time was described by the Committee on College Women Students and the War as follows:

The Committee recognizes that no general pattern for colleges and universities enrolling women students can or should be laid down. Each institution should make only such adaptations as its own facilities and local need make desirable. Initiative and resourcefulness are prime requisites in order that colleges may give such education as shall make it possible for its students to render maximum service to war and yet, at the same time, be prepared for effective living in the post-war world.³⁶

36. *Ibid.*

LIBERAL EDUCATION AND THE
COLLEGE CURRICULUM

THE UNREST IN HIGHER EDUCATION

THERE has been no period in the history of higher education in the United States when such widespread uncertainty and confusion prevailed as during the war years. That the war should dislocate and disrupt the work of institutions of higher education was inevitable, but the disruption and dislocation were far greater than they need have been as a result of the uncertainty in the policies of the government with regard to the utilization of the resources of higher education and the status of students and faculties under the Selective Service regulations. Nevertheless, the period from 1940 to 1946 will probably stand out as one of the most significant and fruitful periods in the history of colleges and universities because of the nation-wide discussion and the extensive literature on the meaning of a liberal education and the methods for achieving it.

The unrest which stimulated the concern about the status and future of higher education antedated the outbreak of the war by several years; but it was brought to a head by a realization that the postwar era would demand serious reconstruction and adjustments at all levels of education. In 1936 a symposium on the organization of humanistic studies in American universities was held at the annual meeting of the American Council of Learned Societies. At the annual meeting in the following year resolutions were presented from the Philological Association and the Linguistic Society, calling upon the Council to make a study of the status of humanistic studies in education and to arrange a conference on the subject with the National Research Council, the Social Science Research Council, and the American Council on Education to consider a joint study of educational trends as they affected the scientific and cul-

tural disciplines. Although the proposed conference was not held, the Council proceeded with the subject and a symposium was organized and papers were read by Howard Mumford Jones, representing the Modern Language Association; by Henry Grattan Doyle, representing the National Federation of Language teachers; and by A. Pelzer Wegener, chairman of a special committee of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South. At the close of the discussion the Council voted "To authorize the Executive Committee to appoint a Committee on Educational Trends and the Humanities, of which one member should be a scholar in close touch with the problem of secondary education."

Following this meeting, the Permanent Secretary of the Council drafted a Memorandum on the Humanities in American Education, in which he proposed an extensive study covering the entire range of education. After these preliminaries, the Executive Committee of the Council at its meeting, January 26, 1939, appointed a committee, consisting of Theodore M. Greene, chairman, Charles C. Fries, Henry M. Wriston, and William Dighton, "for the purpose of drafting a detailed plan for a study of educational trends and the humanities." The chairman presented a first report on December 1, 1939, and in 1940 made an extensive trip through the South and West, where he discussed the scope and character of the proposed study with individuals and groups in many colleges and universities. A draft of the report, when completed, was submitted to criticism and discussion, then revised and published in 1943 under the title *Liberal Education Re-examined: Its Role in a Democracy* by Harper and Brothers. The interest of the American Council of Learned Societies helped to focus attention on the subject of liberal education and the preservation of the humanities throughout the country.

Dissatisfaction with the elective system, the failure of colleges to provide a balanced education and a common background to students, the growing demands for vocational or professional, at the expense of general, education, the status of graduate education, and the preparation of college teachers were all factors which had begun to cause unrest for some time before the war. The new economic conditions, the conflicts

between the ideals of democracy and other forms of government, the new role of the United States in international affairs, the new intellectual interests which resulted from this situation, and the spectacular development of the sciences and technology, the consequent conflict between the claims of the humanities and the sciences in education, and the new vistas opened up to the millions of young men and women who saw service in all parts of the world—all combined to emphasize the urgent need of a new direction and orientation for education at the college and university level. To these forces will probably have to be added, although it may yet be too early to judge, the influence of the large numbers of veterans who crowded into the institutions of higher education. From whatever point of view the situation might be considered, it was clear that a new era in higher education was in prospect.

In a culture in which there had always existed conflicts between liberal or academic education and the demands for practical studies, between a type of education which has continued to be described as "aristocratic" even down to the present and the education of the common man, between the study of the past and the study of the immediately contemporary, a reconciliation was long overdue. Since the days of Benjamin Franklin, liberal education has been regarded as a luxury or "ornamental," and has been contrasted with an education that is "useful." More recently Franklin's distinction between the "ornamental" and the "useful" has been replaced by the distinction between the "static" and the "dynamic" types of education. Increasingly, educational theory emphasized the importance of adapting education to the divergent abilities and interests of the students and their adjustment to the social, political, and economic needs of the day.

Viewed in the light of the history of American culture since the founding of the Republic, the problems not only in higher but also at other levels of education are not new. What is surprising is that the reconciliation between the two aspects of American culture—the intellectual and the practical—was not made earlier. Emerson in *The American Scholar* had already noted the distinction between the intellectual and the man of affairs when he wrote: "There goes on in the world a notion

that the scholar should be a recluse, a valetudinarian—as unfit for any handiwork or public labor as a penknife for an axe. The so-called ‘practical men’ sneer at speculative men, as if, because they speculate or *see*, they could do nothing.” And de Tocqueville at about the same time said of the Americans that “general ideas alarm their minds, which are accustomed to positive calculations, and they hold practice in more honor than theory.”

The clash between the contending aims in education—the liberal and the practical—began a century ago, although it was already inherent in the proposals for an education “adapted to the genius of the Government of the United States” in the last two decades of the eighteenth century.¹ In his *Report to the Corporation of Brown University on Changes in the System of Education* (1850), President Francis Wayland deplored the fact that the colleges were not making their proper contribution to the economic needs of the country. “With the present century,” he wrote, “a new era dawned upon the world. A host of new sciences arose, all holding important relations to the progress of civilization.” The colleges, which were suffering from a decline in enrollments, might appeal for funds to enable them to continue in their traditional ways, or they might “adapt the article produced to the wants of the community.” The first method had been tried and failed. “We are, therefore, forced to adopt the supposition that our colleges are not filled because we do not furnish the education desired by the people. . . . Is it not time to inquire whether we cannot furnish an article for which the demand will be, at least, somewhat more remunerative?” Accordingly, Wayland proposed that the work of the university be adapted “to the wants of the whole community” by providing courses in the science of teaching, principles of agriculture, and the application of science to the arts. “Selling education to the public” and “fitting the college to the student” are not ideas born of the technological and business civilization of the twentieth century.

President Henry P. Tappan of the University of Michigan was also concerned at the same time about the low enrollments

1. See A. O. Hansen, *Liberalism and American Education in the Eighteenth Century*, New York, 1926.

in college, which he sought to explain in his *University Education* (1851) as follows:

We inspire no general desire for high education, and fail to collect students because we promise and do not perform. Hence we fall into disrepute, and young men of ability contrive to prepare themselves for active life without our aid. In connection with this, the commercial spirit of our country, and the many avenues to wealth which are opened before enterprise, create a distaste for study deeply inimical to education. The manufacturer, the merchant, the gold-digger, will not pause in their career to gain intellectual accomplishments. While gaining knowledge, they are losing the opportunities to gain money. The political condition of our country, too, is such that a high education and a high order of talent do not generally form some guarantee of success. The tact of the demagogue triumphs over the accomplishments of the scholar and the man of genius.

While deploring this situation, Tappan nevertheless put forward a strong plea for the cultivation of pure scholarship, but without neglecting education of a practical nature.

The question in education, as in religion, is not what men desire, but what they need. This must govern us in determining the form and quality of our educational institutions. Now when it is asked, What we need in the way of education? we may reply, either that we need to fit men well for professional life, and for the general business of the world in the mechanical arts, in agriculture, in commerce; or, we might reply, that we need all in due order and proportion. The last reply would, unquestionably, be the correct one.

The trend was, however, already set in favor of electives and expanding the college curriculum to meet the desires of a wider clientele, what Tappan referred to as "the idea of fitting our colleges to the temper of the multitude." Twenty years later President F. A. P. Barnard of Columbia College stated that electives were "evidently well adapted to catch at this time the wind of the popular favor." The curriculum had, in fact, become overcrowded by the addition of new subjects to the old without any relaxation in requirements resulting in a sacrifice of standards of scholarship and thoroughness. Tappan's description of the situation as "an immense and voracious deglutition of knowledges where mental digestion is estimated accord-

ing to the rapidity with which subjects are disposed of" may not have been exactly accurate in his day; but it was a prophetic anticipation of what was to happen, when out of the elective system the quantitative dosage of education in terms of points, units, and credits was developed. From the middle of the nineteenth century on, the American college assumed a character of its own.

The American college is a unique institution. Unlike institutions of higher education in other parts of the world, the college overlaps at one end with what is elsewhere regarded as secondary education, and with the first years of university education at the other. From this situation arise some of the difficulties of defining the purposes and aims of college education, since it has the responsibility for continuing the general or liberal education of the students and of giving them some form of professional or occupational preparation. The confusion becomes still more aggravated when the college is called upon to provide specific preparation through premedical, pre-law, and preengineering courses. Building on the uncertain foundations of high school education, the college is called upon to provide preliminary and introductory courses in subjects which students should have completed before entrance. Able and well-prepared students consequently find themselves in classes with students who are less able, and either less well-prepared or entirely unprepared, for the courses, with discouraging effects on the former. Nor is there sufficient difference between the methods of instruction, daily assignments, quizzes, and examinations in college and high school to challenge students to become intellectually independent and to assume some responsibility for their own education.

In European universities students are technically *in statu pupillari* in the sense only that their conduct is more or less governed by certain regulations; in their studies, however, they enjoy complete freedom, restricted only by their own knowledge that at some time at the end of their course an accounting will be expected of them. The American student is completely free to regulate his life and his extracurricular activities as he pleases; in the main purpose which should bring him to college—to get an education—he continues to be kept in lead-

ing-strings, which are held almost as tightly as they are in high school. The system itself stands in the way of his education. And here there is another paradox. In the past twenty-five years or so the theory has been widely disseminated that over-protection of children by their parents is detrimental to the proper development of their personality. In the same period there have been organized in the interest of guidance elaborate systems of deans, subdeans, counselors, tutors, and advisers, whose responsibility it is to find out and record everything that can be known about a student (and often about his parents) in order to guide him not only in the choice of courses suited to his abilities but to foster the growth of his personality in the right direction. Undoubtedly a system of advising and counseling students is desirable, but there is something ominous in the use of phrases like "human engineering" and "processing the student" which are occasionally found in this connection.

"What is a student?" is as grave a question in the present period of transition as "What is education?" The late Professor Carl Brigham, discussing the admission of students to college, stated a few years ago that "An organization set up for the sole purpose of collecting tickets at the gate is now asked to show people to their seats." He might have continued to say that the organization is now expected not only to see that the seats are comfortable, but that the ticket-holders are made as comfortable as possible in them. The effect in the long run is to absolve the student of any responsibility for educating himself. The development of initiative, self-reliance, and resourcefulness is among the cherished aims of education in a democracy; but the recent trends in theory and practice seem to point in the direction of prolonging the intellectual dependence of the student.

To this dependence the internal organization of college education has in no small measure contributed. The adoption of the elective system helped to destroy any commonly accepted concept of a college education, and with it the meaning of an educated person. The arguments for the elective system, when it was first introduced, were that it would provide free play for individual differences of interests, and, to quote a statement made by Dean Briggs of Harvard University in his *Annual Re-*

port, 1901-02, that "of any two subjects efficiently taught for the same length of time, one is about as good as another and deserves equal recognition in a scheme of examinations." It was based on the assumption that the college student was sufficiently mature and had sufficient understanding to plan his own curriculum, and that the subject chosen was unimportant, provided the same amount of time was devoted to it as to any other.

The elective system, described by Professor S. E. Morison, the historian of Harvard University, as "the greatest crime of the century against American youth—depriving him of his classical heritage," spread throughout the country. Criticisms began to be heard early in the twentieth century. Thus, Charles Francis Adams, in a Phi Beta Kappa address delivered in 1906, said: "So far as I have been able to ascertain through twenty-five years of the discussions of the Harvard Board of which I have been a member, the authorities are as far apart as ever they were. There is no agreement, no united effort to a given end." In his *Annual Report*, 1906-07, President Jacob Gould Schurman of Cornell University referred to the same absence of direction: "The college is without clear-cut notions of what a liberal education is and how it is to be secured. . . . and the pity of it is that it is not a local or special disability but a paralysis affecting every college of arts in America."

The era of free electives spent itself early in the present century and was succeeded by a period in which efforts were made to secure some order out of the chaos. These efforts were in the direction of organizing programs in terms of majors and minors, or of concentration and distribution, permitting election but within certain groups of studies. Few institutions, however, adopted the practice of defining in advance what a student might be expected to cover during his four college years or of rounding out his studies by a comprehensive examination.

The efforts to correct the vagaries of free elective system failed to meet the situation. By the time they were undertaken another system had been adopted which militated against any possibility of viewing education as a whole. This system was the organization of education in terms of credits, units, or points. Hence the student on entering college is expected to open a

noninterest bearing account with the registrar and, when that account shows the accumulation of one hundred and twenty points in a currency which itself is variable and unstandardized, he becomes entitled to his degree. The account is built up in instalments which may or may not be sequential or articulated, but which consist of packages of courses, each with its designated number of points. The organization of the courses and of instruction with their respective assignments, exercises, and quizzes, is such as to stand in the way of continuity of an educational program and of the assimilation of ideas and meanings. Even the corrective, adopted in some colleges and curiously hailed as an important innovation—the provision of a “reading period”—is no guarantee that the main end of an education will be achieved. President Tappan’s criticism, made nearly a century ago, could be applied to the college scene today almost without change. The conception of education in his day, wrote Tappan, was “not the orderly and gradual growth of the mind according to its own innate laws, fixed by God himself, but an immense and voracious deglutition of knowledges where the mental digestion is estimated according to the rapidity with which subjects are disposed of.” What was in Tappan’s day an object of criticism has since that time become a matter of organization on the basis of quantitative measures and interchangeable parts. It is not without significance perhaps that the average American student, when asked whether he knows a subject, will never answer by a direct affirmative or negative; his answer will normally be that he has or has not “had” it. A college degree is, in fact, evidence only of four years of attendance at college and the successful completion of a certain number of courses recorded in a transcript; it is rare to find two transcripts that contain an identical list of courses.

Evidence of the insecurity and absence of any cumulative effect of a college education was provided in the report of the Carnegie Foundation on *The Student and His Knowledge* (1938), based on a survey of Secondary and Higher Education in Pennsylvania. The existence of variability between the colleges of the state and between students in the same college, which was revealed by the survey, was not nearly as important as the uncertainty of the students’ knowledge which was discovered

as the result of tests in general culture. The tests were not intended to cover all the results of a college education; they were definitely constructed to find out how much general knowledge students had acquired and retained. The tests were criticized as tests of "mere knoweldge," but the critics rarely indicated what they meant by an education without knowledge or how the "intangibles," assumed to be the concomitants of an education, can be attained without knowledge. The fact remains that when submitted to the same general tests, many students with college degrees were no better informed on the subjects tested than were a large number of pupils still in high school; about one-sixth of the students tested over a two-year period showed that they had even lost ground academically. In general, the results indicated unevenness in the amount of knowledge retained as well as a lack of balance in the program of studies.

Further evidence of this lack of balance has been produced by the Graduate Record Examination, developed after the Pennsylvania survey by the Carnegie Foundation with the cooperation of a large number of colleges and universities throughout the country. The tests employed in this examination are constructed on the same general principles as those used in the Pennsylvania survey, but are being constantly improved in the light of further experimentation. The normal result of the graphs produced for individual students on the basis of the Graduate Record Examination is to reveal intensive specialization in some one field of study, and a high degree of variability in others. It is rare to find a graph which indicates a broad all-round education, such as might be expected if colleges devoted themselves to providing the kind of general education adapted to the needs of modern society. The results are cumulative; and with still further specialization in the graduate school, the complaint frequently heard that holders of advanced degrees are illiterate outside of their chosen field of special studies should not cause surprise.

The implications of the report on *The Student and His Knowledge* do not appear to have been recognized; the further development of the meaning of the Graduate Record Examination may be postponed until the colleges assume their normal functions in the postwar years. The rapid expansion and proliferation of courses, a result not only of the expansion of knowledge itself

but also of the effort to fit the college curriculum to "the temper of the multitude," had already begun to cause some concern in the years following World War I. It was this concern which led to a variety of experiments to integrate knowledge by means of orientation courses, survey courses, and "general education," which resulted in courses offering a little of everything in related fields of knowledge and nothing in particular. The notion that intellectual integration could be promoted by the mechanical process of substituting *disjecta membra* of a variety of fields of knowledge for the fields themselves was fallacious from the start. Integration is an intellectual process, which should come from a grasp and understanding of meanings and of the interrelation of ideas; it is a function of good teaching as it is of sound learning. The integrated course may spread a somewhat diffuse panorama before the student, but it fails to convey the idea that areas of knowledge have been developed as tools and methods for understanding the world; as disciplines, in short. The parts and fragments which are put together to form an integrated course begin, in the long run, to constitute a new and different course, wholly unrelated to the areas from which they are drawn.

From whatever point of view the problems of college education are approached, the only conclusion that can be reached is that there is no sense of direction or any genuine definition of aim. There are innumerable statements of innumerable objectives which, when added together, still fail to give a clear sense of direction. The period between the two wars has been marked by a number of experiments, but these on the whole have been mechanical and external devices, too often to enlist public interest and support; and, as the late President Walter A. Jessup wrote, "common to other, competitive social and economic processes. Just now," continued President Jessup,

we are in the mood to follow the new. Not only do we like to buy a new model of motor car or a new radio; we are attracted by the "new education." In bidding for favor we are streamlining the job—our current models glitter with gadgets that smack of the factory and the salesman. Perhaps a college can gain by adopting sixteen cylinders, hydraulic brakes, and air-flow design. Perhaps so. Or it may be that a college should be organized with multiple tubes and

high-fidelity loud speaker. But certainly the college which rests its case on doing something new or adopting some gadget of the moment would do well to consider the long road it must travel. It might well recognize that the institution must be administered with a view to its whole task—not a temporary task of exploitation or publicity of news releases or reorganization on a current pattern, whatever it may be, but a task to be measured ultimately by the effect of the college upon the student himself.²

The problems confronting the American college are many and varied. Some arise from the struggle for survival and the consequent competition for funds and students. Some arise from the increase in enrollments, which is itself not open to criticism but becomes serious when the standards of preparation in the high schools are uncertain and variable, and when the theory is propounded that students will do well in college irrespective of what they may have chosen to study in high school. Other problems can be traced back to the traditional conflict, which has been discussed earlier, between cultural and practical education. Those who decry the current trend toward vocational preparation in college fail to realize that the provision of such preparation is an obligation. The issue is not whether vocational preparation should or should not be provided, but rather at what stage in the student's career it should come, and whether it cannot be organized in a mold better adapted to it than the academic organization.

There is, however, another problem which has not received the attention that it merits. Largely as a result of the standards set up by accrediting agencies, the practice has grown up of requiring teachers at the college level to hold the Ph.D. degree. Introduced originally to promote the advancement of scholarship and research, this degree has in the main become a license to teach. Valuable as the training for the degree may be, no provision is made to prepare the future college teacher for the work that he is to undertake. There is, however, another and more serious defect which may militate against effective teaching. The tendency in the requirements for the Ph.D. is in the direction of increasing and more intensive specialization, with

2. "The American College," in *Educational Yearbook, 1943*, of the International Institute of Teachers College, Columbia University, edited by I. L. Kandel. New York, 1943, pp. 180 f.

the result that what the student may gain in depth of scholarship and research he may lose in breadth of understanding the relationship of his field of specialization to the needs of the college student. The next consequence is a type of compartmentalization which leads to failure to see the aims and purposes of education as a whole. Evidence of this situation is most clearly provided in the inability of specialists in the various branches of the sciences to organize courses that will interpret for the general student the meaning and place of science in a modern liberal education. On the other hand, the study of the humanities, strongly influenced at first by the standards of German scholarship and research and later in an effort to meet the competition of the sciences and technology, has in large measure come to be devoted to a process of refined fact-finding, and has run the risk of losing a sense of its main purpose.

The application of scientific methods to research in the humanities no doubt has its place, and a valuable place, for the advancement of scholarship; but it is an inadequate preparation for those whose task as college teachers will be to introduce the student to the real meaning of the humanities. No one has more accurately and more succinctly described the situation than Henry Seidel Canby. In an address on *The American Scholar and the War*, prepared for the Modern Language Association of America, Mr. Canby wrote in 1943:

Has literature for us been the articulate tradition of civilization, or has it been, sometimes, often, a set of test tubes, a collection of samples, a program of experiments upon which the chemist sets to work? What has been the relation between literary research and that teaching of literature which should be the primary training and extension and uplifting of the imagination? I submit that the extensive literary research of the last quarter-century has made teaching more accurate, has trained new researchers in better methodologies, and beyond that has almost completely failed to insure in the teaching of literature the growth, the fervor, the taste, the insight, the assimilation of what can only be assimilated and can never be directly taught, which alone justify eminence and perhaps pre-eminence for literature among the humanities. The great teachers of literature have not got their power over literature as such, over poetry as such, in their work for the doctor's degree, no matter how useful that may have been.

The charge may be disputed, but the prevalence of handbooks or cram-books in the humanities is at least some indication of the standards that students expect to meet in their examinations. They read about books but not into them.

It would be difficult, even if it were desirable, to distinguish in graduate schools between those students who intend to devote themselves to college teaching and those who plan to engage in research and the advancement of scholarship. Frequently the two careers are inseparable, and the graduate school should assume responsibility for giving the future college teachers some insight into the work in which they will engage. This responsibility would mean more than offering courses on principles of teaching in college. It should result in a sweeping reform of the system which too frequently prevails of course requirements, which become progressively narrower and more intensively compartmentalized. The current movement in the direction of "area" or "regional" studies should help to break down departmental barriers. Even more drastic reforms may be needed to promote an intelligent understanding of the forces which have in the past contributed to the development of the culture and civilization of the world, and which are exercising such potent influences on a world in transition.

Under the conditions which prevail at present, the young teacher, trained in the methods of scholarship and research, enters upon his career as more or less the master of a special field, with a penumbra of such comprehensive requirements as he may have had to meet, but with little understanding of the value of his field as a contribution to education in general. If he looks for promotion, he will discover that generally merit is acquired in the eyes of administrative authorities not for teaching ability but for more research, which means preempting a still narrower plot in his special field in the hope that it may become the basis of still another course. Only in rare instances are problems of teaching, which include not only methods of instruction but the appropriate organization of content, the concern of college faculties; they can, it is assumed, be left to the department on the other side—usually the far side—of the campus.

At the first International Conference on Examinations, the late Professor G. Delisle Burns remarked that "One of the worst

troubles in the examination system is that it has been devised by professors, and the best thing that professors can think of is themselves; they therefore test candidates by what are tests of competence for professors, but not for bankers and other persons.”³ For “examinations” it is only necessary to substitute “education” to make this statement applicable to present conditions in college teaching. From this arises the frequent gibe that college teachers live in ivory towers, a gibe which may or may not have some justification, but which threatens the foundations of education when it is transferred from the professors to the subjects that they profess. For it is this kind of gibe which leads to the introduction of courses that are more “practical” or more “functional” and initiate the student into the facts of life in his ever-changing environment, and to contempt for those areas of intellectual endeavor which have been distilled from the experience of man through the ages. Scholarship is important; appreciation of the techniques of research is important; and both must be the possession of the teacher. More important than either, however, is the ability to inspire in the student a feeling that a course is more than a requirement to be met for academic purposes, and that it is intended as one way of contributing to his understanding of man and his world. In other words, it is not the “subject” nor “books” (not even the selected “best books”) that impart a liberal education, but the teacher. The influence of a mechanized civilization on the organization of education has already been mentioned. It is perhaps significant that in the years of crisis the emphasis was placed upon “acceleration”—the completion of the same quantity of requirement in a shorter time; “ignition” seems to have been overlooked entirely.

Unrest and uncertainty are not new phenomena in higher education. The conflict of aims began a century ago; it began to become more marked as the elective system spread throughout the country and began to be subjected to criticism in the early years of the present century. The rapid increase in the number of students enrolled in colleges after World War I gave rise to the question whether the traditional college curriculum, even with the latitude offered by the elective system, was adapted to the abilities, needs, and interests of the students. Attention was

3. *Conference on Examinations*, New York, 1931, p. 226.

focused on this question by the growing percentage of students who dropped out of college for other than financial reasons. The unrest in higher education, however, was only a part of the mounting unrest in American education and of conflicting educational theories generally which marked the years following World War I.

On the one hand, there were those who continued to maintain their faith in traditional cultural values, a point of view intensified by the highly specialized and at the same time somewhat narrow training given in the graduate schools from which college teachers were recruited. On the other hand, there were those who advocated the adaptation of education to the interests and needs of the individual student and to the rapidly changing culture. In a world which, they claimed, was becoming increasingly complex, in which new interests were rapidly developing through the rapid expansion of the sciences and technology and their effects upon economic life and organization, education cannot stand still without running the risk of broadening the "cultural lag." Education must have relevance and meaning for the students in the world in which they live and are to play their part. Both groups were equally concerned with the question of what knowledge is of the greatest worth both to the individual and to society.

The answers of both groups differed, as they had done in the days of Wayland and Tappan. They differed, however, for another reason, and that was the vast accumulation of knowledge in the century that had elapsed. While the traditional practices were continued in most colleges, and a college education continued in the main to consist in the accumulation of a number of points required for a degree, in others an attempt was made to provide a common foundation for all students in survey or orientation courses, which were also designed to help students in the choice of some area of specialization. Out of this attempt to bring some order into the program of college education, there developed the movement for what was known as "General Education." It is significant that the use of the term "liberal education" was avoided. There was, however, no general consensus either about the concept of general education or about its content

except some vague idea that experimentation was needed as much in education as in other areas of cultural activities.

THE SEARCH FOR VALUES AND LIBERAL EDUCATION

The general education movement cannot be entirely dismissed as an effort to solve the complex problems which had been accumulating in college education. It may, indeed, have contributed in some respects the plans which were developed for the reorganization of the college program in the postwar period. It lacked, however, that broad sense of direction implicit in the concept of a liberal education. The only values with which it was concerned were adaptation to the needs of the students and immediate relevance to the contemporary scene. But even while the movement and the different experiments under its aegis were being discussed, another serious challenge to all concerned with education for democracy began to manifest itself. The ideal of democracy and of democratic institutions was threatened by the rise of totalitarian forms of government, which, though they varied among themselves, were united in decrying the democratic ideal. The "war of ideas" and the outbreak of war helped to concentrate attention on the urgent need of considering the values which democracies were fighting to preserve.

The literature on college education, which began to appear as soon as the war broke out in Europe and which mounted in volume as the war progressed, attacked the absence of a sense of direction and purpose in education; and, in emphasizing the importance of liberal education in general and of the humanities in particular, sought to re-emphasize the urgent need of the guidance of values if education was to make its contribution to the preservation of the democratic ideal. This was all the more necessary in an atmosphere in which the popular demand was for practical training or training in specific skills and theory insisted that education must be "functional" or "instrumental" or "meaningful" in the sense that it gave instruction in facts of immediate relevance in everyday life. Moral, cultural, or spiritual values, if they were mentioned at all, were referred to with derision or dismissed as "static" or "authoritarian" in a society which was "dynamic," and in which values were constantly being recast to meet the needs of a rapidly changing culture. Those, how-

ever, who decried moral, cultural, or spiritual values as intangibles, and who claimed to derive their notions of functionalism or instrumentalism from the philosophy of pragmatism appear to have overlooked Dewey's statement that "Some goods are not good *for* anything; they are just goods. Any other notion leads to an absurdity. For we cannot stop asking the question about an instrumental good, one whose value lies in its being good *for* something, unless there is at some point something intrinsically good, good for itself."⁴

Two points stood out clearly in the critical analysis to which college education was subjected in the extensive body of literature which was published from 1940 on. The first point was that the values to be achieved through education had been ignored or neglected. The second point which was emphasized throughout was that the essence of a sound concept of liberal education lies not so much in the subjects studied but in the acquisition of values through contact with significant ideas and significant minds. The failure to realize that subjects *quâ* subjects are not in themselves liberalizing led to a conflict between those who espoused the claims of certain subjects as inherently liberal in themselves and those who emphasized the importance of catering to the particular needs and interests of students as individuals. Knowledge, facts, information can be acquired; but more important, if education is to be liberal, is the effect upon the individual. A liberal education is far more than the acquisition of knowledge; its aim should be to give meaning to life and a guiding philosophy for action. The Nazis were not lacking in knowledge and especially such knowledge as was directed to their immediate aims; what led to their destruction was the deliberate rejection of humanism and moral and spiritual values. Information, facts, and knowledge are essential; but they are vehicles only for developing a sense of values, a sense of the good, the true, and the beautiful. But together with a standard of values there must also be standards of evaluation and discrimination. One reason for the futile attempt to promote creative activities has been that creativity was aimed at directly without being preceded by that assimilation and reflection from which standards of value could be developed. A liberal education has failed unless it has cul-

4. J. Dewey, *Democracy and Education*, New York, 1916, p. 283.

tivated in the student ability to think clearly, with judgment, taste, understanding, imagination, and critical-mindedness. It is concerned as much with the development of feeling as with intellectual training; with the cultivation of the emotions as much as of reason. It does not ignore the importance of meaning or relevance; but, since its focal point is or should be life, it can be broader in range and perspective than an education concerned with immediate application. In the wholesome trend to restore the genuine meanings and purposes of a liberal education and to abandon the practice of labeling certain subjects as liberal, those who sought to place an emphasis on values stressed the fact that the most important among these values are the moral and spiritual, and never so important as at a time when men were struggling against the forces of evil to preserve the worth and dignity of the human being. Inherent in this struggle was the assertion of the rights and freedom of the individual as over against the dominance of force and authoritarianism. At the same time, the critics of recent tendencies in American educational theory protested against the confusion which had arisen between freedom and license and the divorce between rights and obligations. The only sure guarantee of both rights and freedom lay, it was argued, in the reference of both to values.

There was, however, in the earlier contribution to the subject of values a tendency to array the humanities over against the sciences. Values, it was argued, could only be derived from the study of the humanities; the sciences as such were neutral and were not concerned with values. The sciences were concerned with the objective search for truth; the humanities were concerned with the discovery not only of the truth but also of the good and the beautiful. The antagonism between the two arose from the notion that sciences were at the root of the latter-day spread of materialism and from the fear that in education they were crowding out the humanities. For this fear there was some foundation, as there was for the fear lest the study of the humanities was abandoning the aims inherent in humanism by imitating the methods of the sciences. Many words were wasted in the effort to deny the possibility of deriving values from the sciences, and in the claim that the true source of values was to be found in the humanities. Greater progress began to be made when it was

admitted that the values of the sciences and the values of the humanities, since they dealt with different aspects of the universe, were complementary to each other.

The antagonism was particularly futile, first because in the narrow, specialized approach to the humanities their values were neglected, and second because the leading scientists had already begun to admit that the sciences could not answer all the questions of life. This admission provided a salutary challenge to the advocates of the humanities to put their own house in order. "The scientist," said Robert A. Millikan, "provides us with extensive enough information regarding what *is*, but unless we have those among us who tell us *what makes for*, and what does not make for, our fundamental well-being, we are lost." So too Einstein, after stating that science can never give us our aims, said, "Once the aims exist, the scientific method provides means to realize them. But it cannot furnish the aims themselves. . . . Perfection of means and confusion of aims seem, in my opinion, to characterize our age." And, finally, Raymond B. Fosdick stressed the same point when he wrote, in the *Annual Report* of the Rockefeller Foundation, 1942, that

The economists and political scientists must help, but so must the physicists and the biologists. And particularly we must rely on the humanists—the historians, the philosophers, the artists, the poets, the novelists, the dramatists—all those who fashion ideas, concepts, and forms that give meaning and value to life and furnish the patterns of conduct. It is they who really construct the world we live in, and it is they who with sensitive awareness to human perplexity and aspiration, and with the power of imaginative presentation can speak effectively to a distracted world.⁵

The antagonisms in the learned world were not due to the bewilderment and confusion which prevailed in the world generally. They were the symptoms of a disease which had for some time been spreading in the world of learning. That disease was intense specialization, so that scholars in neighboring areas of knowledge ceased to understand each other or became somewhat self-assertive. Great as have been the contributions to scholarship, the very specialization which had made it possible

5. The three statements are quoted in Norman Foerster, editor, *The Humanities at War*, Princeton University Press, 1944, p. v.

to produce them helped to undermine any general concept of culture or liberal education. Nowhere has the situation in the modern world of learning been so clearly and so accurately described as in the following statement by Ortega y Gasset:

The most immediate result of this *unbalanced* specialization has been that to-day, when there are more "scientists" than ever, there are much less "cultured" men than, for example, about 1750. And the worst is that with these turnspits of science not even the real progress of science itself is assured. For science needs from time to time, as a necessary regulation of its own advance, a labor of re-constitution, and, as I have said, this demands an effort toward unification, which grows more and more difficult, involving as it does ever vaster regions of the world of knowledge.⁶

The humanists, strongly entrenched in schools and universities for centuries, were disposed to decry the rising place of the sciences. Had they not lost their historical perspective they might have recalled that the revival of humanism and the birth of the sciences both had their origin in man's desire to learn more about himself and the world in which he lived. They might have recalled also the reciprocal interplay between the sciences and philosophy which began in the seventeenth century, having been neglected since the classical period of Greece and Rome. At the same time, scientists were to blame in cutting themselves off from all concern with the humanities on the plea that all the answers about the meaning of life could be provided by the sciences alone. The scientists at any rate have surrendered their claim, but, with a few notable exceptions, they have made little or no attempt to define the meaning of sciences in the life of man. The same trend is to be found in the so-called social sciences, which, adopting the objective methods of the sciences, engage in fact-finding and collection and analysis of relevant data but without any suggestion of the standard of relevance by which the facts or the data are to be evaluated.

The literature on liberal education which appeared in the past six years was on the whole devoted more to a defense and a campaign for the preservation of the humanities. It was not until the time came for the definite planning of the postwar college

6. José Ortega y Gasset, *The Revolt of the Masses*, New York, 1932, p. 125.

curriculum that an effort had to be made to reconcile differences between different areas of learning and to find a place for each in a well-rounded program of liberal education. The search for values did have one healthy, perhaps an unanticipated, result. It began to be realized that no subject is in itself "liberalizing;" that a liberal education can only be achieved by liberally minded teachers and students in contact with significant ideas. What T. S. Eliot said in an address on *The Classics and the Man of Letters* on subjects as "disciplines" applies equally to the claim that some subjects are more liberal than others. "I think," he said, that the defense of any study purely as "discipline" in the modern sense can be maintained too obstinately. . . . The defence of "discipline" in the abstract, the belief that any "mental discipline" carried out in the right way and far enough will produce an abstract "educated man," seems to have some relation to the egalitarian tendencies of the nineteenth century, which extended to subjects of study the same equality held for the human beings who might study them.⁷

COLLEGE TEACHERS

The liberalizing influence of a subject depends in the main on the competence of the teacher, and many a subject which in the past has been claimed to be essential for a liberal education has been taught illiberally. It is the competent teacher who can arouse visions of greatness in students. While references to the importance of competence and breadth in teaching in contrast to the narrowness and even the parochialism of the specialist did appear here and there in the extensive literature on liberal education, there still remained a sort of special pleading for certain subjects as more liberal than others. The fundamental issue was raised, however, by John Herman Randall, Jr., in a notable article, "Which Are the Liberating Arts?"⁸ Before this question can be answered, the aims to be achieved must first be considered. Education should produce free men able to use opportunities to make the most of themselves, to develop their powers and capacities as free citizens and responsible members of society. Liberal education is the process of making men fit for freedom.

7. T. S. Eliot, *The Classics and the Man of Letters*, Oxford, 1943, p. 19.

8. *American Scholar*, Spring, 1944, pp. 135 ff.

Subjects in themselves are not necessarily liberal; whether they liberalize depends upon the way in which they are taught. Randall then proceeds to raise the fundamental issue of contemporary education and to provide an answer:

Since all the arts and sciences can be taught illiberally, and usually are, what is the way out? Well, we have found by experience that there are various ways of teaching them liberally—that is, in such a fashion as to reveal their place in the universe of knowledge, and not leave them mere “specialties,” isolated and unrelated, with no relevance to anything else. There are many ways in which a liberal teacher can make them part of the education of a whole man, who through them may come to understand himself and his powers, his world and his relation to it. There are many roads to freedom, to the achievement of perspective, toward making the arts instruments of liberation from the insistencies of the moment so that the student can see where these insistencies fit into the picture, and why they are so insistent. Unlike most of those arguing about liberal education to-day, I can see no single panacea, and cannot hitch my wagon to any one of the schemes so plentifully proposed. That is a large part of the trouble in this whole business—there are so many drugs on the market, excellent specifics in themselves, which are being dubiously promoted as nostrums and specifics. . . .

To be a nation of competent technicians does seem to be our American destiny. But we can resolve not merely to train competent technicians; we can also educate them as free men and free minds. If our education succeeds in producing free minds, men of understanding and vision, then these men can go on in that liberal spirit to be men of power. And in the marriage of knowledge and power they can become whole men, men who have found something of *humanitas*.⁹

The major value of the discussions of the reform of the college curriculum lay, in Randall's opinion, in stirring up the teachers and shaking them out of their ruts. Teachers everywhere were enlisted in discussions of the curriculum reforms needed in American colleges. Whether they were shaken out of the ruts into which specialists tend to settle and acquired the comprehension and vision of a liberally-minded teacher it is as yet too early to say.

9. *Ibid.*, pp. 146-148.

Since accrediting and other organizations began to attach the importance which they did to the Ph.D. as one of the standards for evaluating colleges, the emphasis shifted from teaching to research. When to this is added an all-to-common practice of promotion in the faculty ranks on the basis of research publications more than on the quality of teaching, the interests of college teachers have been diverted from their primary obligation. In the rapid expansion of graduate schools the training has been mainly on methodology and techniques of research, despite the fact that the majority of graduate students look to college teaching as their careers and the established fact that only a minority of those trained to engage in research rarely continue to produce. In a discussion of the college faculty, the late President Walter A. Jessup of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching referred to the situation as follows:

In the struggle for academic respectability in which many institutions have engaged, much emphasis has been placed upon external trappings of scholarship that are all too frequently specious. The possession of a doctorate or the multiplication of trivial publications has often tended to blind those who are responsible for selecting, promoting, and making comfortable the teaching staff to the fact that personality is still an indispensable element in an institution's effectiveness. Standardizing associations meant well in their pressure on colleges to increase the number of doctors on their staff. This has resulted all too frequently in an accumulation of colorless, superficial scholars, who were quick to recognize that the likeliest road to promotion lay in the direction of "publication." It is to be hoped that more institutions will recognize that their future is largely dependent upon the skill with which they select, promote, and make happy the right persons on their staff. Life's one institution most whole-heartedly devoted to the development of the individual as a unit in society—the college—can ill afford to permit the mechanics of administration, of promotion, of teaching, or what not, to interfere with the full and free development of high personal quality. The freedom that flourishes where sympathy and respect prevail is a priceless asset to an institution of learning. In the attempt to solve the problem of education intelligently and simply we frequently fail to provide a place in our scheme of things for the teacher who is an artist. Fortunate is the college which has as

its central aim the desire to recognize, liberate, and preserve this essential, personal element in its teaching staff.¹⁰

Professor Fred B. Millett, after discussing the encroachment of scientific method into the field of the humanities, the impressive quantity and the questionable quality of the scholarly production, describes the effects of graduate study on the future teacher in the following words:

What is shocking is what the graduate school does to the human material with which it works. On the whole, I should be willing to defend the proposition that most of the men who complete their work for the Ph.D. degree are less vital, less broadminded, more narrow in interests than they were when they entered the graduate school. Anyone who has observed the passage of students through the graduate school will have noticed how frequently there takes place a slow drying-up of the personality and its movement in the direction of narrowness and pedantry.

The effects of scientific method on humanistic studies in the graduate school and its effects on the victims of the academic torture-house are less serious than the effects upon undergraduate education in the field of the humanities. For the objective of training in the American graduate school is allegedly preparation for the teaching of undergraduate students. It is problematical whether any graduate training could be devised that is less calculated to produce the kind of teachers humanistic studies demand at the undergraduate level. These studies call for teachers with vitality, with broad esthetic and cultural interests, with sharpened critical faculties, with far-ranging intellectual curiosity. Graduate education in the humanities is much more likely to send into undergraduate teaching men with low vitality, narrow interests, naive esthetic and critical judgments, and an intellectual curiosity that is either nonexistent or is limited to a narrow corner of the field the teacher has been tilling. The results on the undergraduates that are submitted to the instruction of such men can easily be imagined.¹¹

Although Professor Millett restricts his discussion to the preparation of teachers of the humanities, the same criticisms could probably be made of the preparation of teachers of the

10. "The American College" in the *Educational Yearbook*, 1943, pp. 185 f.

11. Fred B. Millett, *The Rebirth of Liberal Education*, New York, 1945, pp. 21 f.

natural and social sciences. Graduate schools have encouraged intense specialization, which is undoubtedly important for the advancement of knowledge, but which may become so narrow and dogmatic as to produce a certain myopia which in the end results in failure to see the relations of a special area of study to the larger whole. Profoundly trained though the specialist may be in his own narrow field, he tends too often to be ignorant of other areas of learning, even those that impinge on his own. From the point of view of student interests, efforts began to be made soon after World War I to break down departmental barriers by the introduction of "integrated courses." This is a doubtful remedy for the disease, since integration of ideas or areas of learning cannot be produced by mechanical organization. Integration of ideas must result from training in a habit of mind, and this training the specialist concerned only with his own narrow interests fails to provide. Only the student who is educated to see the relationships of different parts of human experience can successfully integrate what he learns.

THE CULT OF THE IMMEDIATE

Because there has been a failure to provide this type of training and because a standard of relevance seems to be needed, there has been a tendency to stress the novel, the modern, the contemporary, and the changing scene. There has thus resulted what T. S. Eliot describes as "a division between those who see no good in anything that is new, and those who see no good in anything else; the antiquation of the old, and the eccentricity and even charlatanism of the new, are both thereby accelerated."¹² On the other hand, there is always the fear of being out of date or even a desire to be out on the frontier of thought, both of which result in futility unless they are checked by a sense of historical perspective. As Professor T. M. Greene points out, too frequently the desire to be modern results in being merely contemporary¹³ and in cultivating the novel merely because it is new without any measure of value other than personal bias. On the other hand, those who worship the past merely because it is

12. *Op. cit.*, p. 14.

13. "The Realities of Our Common Life," in *The Humanities after the War*, edited by Norman Foerster, p. 35.

the past and refuse to see any meaning or relevance in it for the present are equally guilty of prejudice. For, in the words of Professor Ralph Barton Perry,

A prejudice for the novel is as enslaving as a prejudice for the past. Nearsightedness and farsightedness are equally blind. The true humanist will not face merely to the past and the distant and the eternal; he will face toward the future, the near, and the temporal. He will face all ways. He will be aware of all parts of the circumference and all horizons up to that moving center where he stands.¹⁴

There is, however, another danger in this tendency to immersion in the immediately contemporary and changing to which Professor Greene has also drawn attention: "Our students who lack historical perspective achieve not modernity of outlook but only contemporaneity; and this means that since the immediate present quickly slips into the past, they are forever getting out of date."¹⁵

The conflicts between the new and the old, the modern and the past have been characteristics of American culture since the founding of the Republic, or even earlier. They were the inevitable results of the effort of a people to adjust themselves to new conditions in a new environment. Thus Carl Russell Fish tersely pointed out the contrast when he wrote that "whereas Washington devoted attention to bringing his gardens to an exquisite perfection, the men of the thirties and forties sought novelty rather than perfection."¹⁶ At about the same period William Ellery Channing wrote: "Our age has been marked by the suddenness, variety, and stupendousness of its revolutions. The events of centuries have been crowded into a single life. Overwhelming changes have rushed upon one too rapidly to give us time to comprehend them."

The conflicts raise the question whether it is the function of educators to adapt their work to the mentality of the common man or to raise his intellectual sights so that he can understand the meaning of the past in the present and of the present for the

14. "A Definition of the Humanities," in *The Meaning of the Humanities*, edited by T. M. Greene, Princeton, 1938, p. 30.

15. *Op. cit.*, p. 35.

16. *The Rise of the Common Man*, p. 105.

future. Education cannot be founded on the "movie habit of mind," which flits from one event to another, from one idea to another without any other measure of value than immediate personal satisfaction. Having no standard of values from the past by which to measure the present, and no convictions except in a kind of spurious scientism, an individual may confuse scepticism and cynicism for open-mindedness and substitute reliance on objective analysis of data for the use of reason.

To reject the past on the plea that conditions of contemporary life are changing rapidly is to abandon all sense of perspective by which the present can be measured and interpreted. To deny that the cultural heritage has anything to teach is to deny the accumulation through the ages of a fund of knowledge and wisdom garnered through human experience. That there has too frequently existed a tendency "to teach from the safe distance of the historical past or predicted future rather than from the living present" may be true, but it is not an argument for rejecting the past. It means rather that education cannot be divorced from the immediate needs of life in the present, and that it must have relevance to and meaning for the present. "But the law is inexorable," wrote A. N. Whitehead, "that education to be living and effective must be directed to informing pupils with those ideas (i.e., of the past), and to creating for them those capacities which will enable them to appreciate the current thought of their epoch."¹⁷ Or, in the words of President H. M. Wriston, "Beneath to-day lies yesterday; beneath techniques lie principles."¹⁸

The general failure to impart a liberal education in the American college can be traced to a great variety of causes—the elective system, the specialization of teachers, the emphasis on so-called research and publication rather than on the quality of teaching, the American temper and climate of opinion, which demands immediate results or rejects tradition in favor of the novel, to some extent the tendency to imitate scientific techniques in areas of learning where their use stands in the way of their more genuine aims, and, finally, a failure to reinterpret and re-adapt the meaning of a liberal education to promote an under-

17. *Aims of Education*, New York, 1929, p. 116.

18. *The Nature of a Liberal Education*, Appleton, Wisc., 1937, p. 133.

standing of the world in which we live. Although he does not carry out the promise of his own definition, Professor Jacques Maritain has succinctly defined the aim of modern education as follows:

Of course the job of education is not to shape the Platonist man-in-himself, but to shape a particular child belonging to a given nation, a given social environment, a given historical age. Yet before being a child of the twentieth century, an American-born or European-born child, a gifted or a retarded child, this child is a child of man.¹⁹

PLANNING POSTWAR COLLEGE EDUCATION

The literature on liberal education began with an assertion of the claims of the humanities for a definite place in the college curriculum. A sharp distinction was drawn at first between the values of the humanities and the values of the sciences, and only gradually was the importance of the sciences in education given some recognition. Following the lead of the American Council of Learned Societies, a number of local and regional conferences were held in different parts of the country in 1943 and 1944 devoted to the consideration of the place of the humanities in the college curriculum. Of these conferences the most notable were those held at Stanford University with delegates from the western states, at the University of Denver with representatives from the Rocky Mountain states, and at Vanderbilt University with representatives from the southern states. Important as were these conferences in re-emphasizing the role that the study of the humanities should continue to play in American life, it was not until the institutions of higher education began to organize committees of their own faculties that patterns for the reorganization of the college curriculum in the postwar era began to appear. While the literature on the humanities and liberal education might be open to the criticism that only one aspect—and that an important aspect—of liberal education was presented and discussed, the committees appointed in the several colleges were inevitably compelled to discuss the claims of all areas of learning for their legitimate place in the college curriculum. For the future of college education the discussions of the issues involved

19. *Education at the Crossroads*, New Haven, 1943, p. 1.

had the advantage of breaking down departmental barriers, of compelling the departmental representatives to view the problems of education at the college level as a whole, and of shifting the emphasis from the special claims of each department to a consideration of the major aims that should govern the education of college students. Compromises and adjustments had inevitably to be made, but a general pattern did emerge. Nevertheless, much was gained from the challenge to each department to define the contribution that it could make to the total concept of a liberal education. To cite one example out of many: In the program organized in 1943-44 for Humanities Division Meetings at Oberlin College, the humanistic values in liberal education were presented from the points of view of the humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences.

Of only one group of reformers can it be said that they claimed to have a complete answer to the problems which had arisen not only in American education but in education throughout the world. About the reform which this group advocated there was an assurance and a dogmatic certainty which left no possible room for doubt in the minds of its members. The criticisms of American education by the group which rallied round President Robert M. Hutchins and Professor Mortimer Adler of the University of Chicago, Professor Mark Van Doren of Columbia University, and President Stringfellow Barr and Professor Scott Buchanan of St. John's College, Annapolis, were on the whole sound and did not differ from the host of other criticisms which appeared at the same time. Nor was there much difference between this group and others in the definitions of the aims of a liberal education. The members of the group advocated the study of man and the world. They stressed the importance of the training of free and responsible citizens for democracy. They emphasized the values of critical thinking, disciplined imagination, intellectual skills and interests, and familiarity with important bodies of literature.

In an address to the graduates of the University of Chicago, President Hutchins stated that

The task of education is to try, even in the midst of disorder and catastrophe, to isolate the permanent and abiding, to help the rising generation acquire the permanent and abiding characteristics of

men and citizens, so that whatever the circumstances under which they live, whatever the new problems they have to face, they may strive to lead the good life and to be good citizens of the good state.

The educational task is always the same because man is always the same. Since man is always the same, what is good for man is always the same. The educational task is the formation of good habits; and the cardinal virtues are still fortitude, temperance, prudence, and justice. The aim of the good citizen is still the good state, which is still founded on justice, equality, and law.²⁰

In addition to their publications, which attracted widespread attention if only because they were stridently different, the group organized as "Education for Freedom, Inc." broadcast thirteen weekly addresses, from December 13, 1943, to March 6, 1944, on the aims and meaning of a liberal education. In one of the addresses President Hutchins declared that

What we need to make the shifting environment intelligible is ideas, standards, and principles; ideas, the instruments of knowledge; standards, to judge objectively the problems that present themselves; and principles of conduct which transcend the particular problems of the day. Our graduates must have above all the capacity to face new situations. This means that they must know how to think. If we can help them learn this, we have done the most that we can do for them.²¹

Equally disarming was the thesis of Mark Van Doren,

that if liberal education is, it is the same for everybody; that the training it requires, in addition to being formal, should be homogeneous through four years—if the best is known, there is no student whom it will not fit, and each should have all of it.

The search for a curriculum is the search for one that is worthy to be uniform and universal. Such a curriculum is the end of any serious thought about liberal education. Liberal studies are by definition studies which we "are not at liberty to omit." An educated society is one whose members know the same things and have the same intellectual powers. The search of the educator should be for these things, and for the comprehension of these powers.²²

20. Quoted in *School and Society*, July 4, 1942, p. 11.

21. Mutual Broadcasting System, December 20, 1943.

22. *Liberal Education*, New York, 1943, pp. 110 f.

The search of the "educators for freedom" was neither long nor intensive. They found the answer where it might have been least expected—in the seven liberal arts of the middle ages. In order "to establish for the country and the educational system the ideal of the common good as determined in the light of reason," President Hutchins stated his convictions as follows:

I suggest again that the primary object of institutions with this aim will be the cultivation of the intellectual virtues. I suggest that the cultivation of the intellectual virtues can be accomplished through the communication of our intellectual traditions and through training in the intellectual disciplines. This means understanding the great thinkers of the past and present, scientific, historical, and philosophical. It means a grasp of the disciplines of grammar, rhetoric, logic, and mathematics; reading, writing, and figuring. It does not, of course, mean the exclusion of contemporary materials. They should be brought in daily to illustrate, confirm, or deny the ideas held by the writers under discussion.²³

Expressed somewhat differently, Van Doren's concept of the Great Tradition is virtually the same:

The medium of liberal education is that portion of the past which is always present. It consists of the liberal arts, literary and mathematical, because they control thinking whenever thinking is done; and equally it consists of the great works in which meaning has been given to the ideal statement that human life is itself an art.

If this is true, the curriculum for any college may be simply described. The four years of every student will be devoted to two principal and simultaneous activities: learning the arts of investigation, discovery, criticism, and communication, and achieving at first hand an acquaintance with the original books, the unkillable classics, in which these miracles happened.²⁴

More specifically Van Doren defines the liberal arts in another passage:

But what are the liberal arts by name? Tradition grounded in more than two millennia of intellectual history, calls them grammar, rhetoric, and logic; arithmetic, music, geometry, and astronomy. As names they may be disappointing; some may sound narrow, others remote. And the objection might be offered that it is

23. *Education for Freedom*, Baton Rouge, La., 1943, p. 60.

24. *Op. cit.*, pp. 144 f.

not the names that matter so much as the essential operations. Even then, however, the operations would have to be named if they were to be kept clear of one another, and their natures understood. And no new names have been found. So the old ones, numbering seven, must be saved until such time as their meaning can be transferred without loss to another set.²⁵

Having agreed by the use of one of the major intellectual virtues, reasoning, that educational salvation is possible only by a return to the seven liberal arts, the educators for freedom by a curious unanimity also agreed that these arts could be cultivated through the study of the same list of one hundred or one hundred and ten great books, few of which appeared later than 1800, when presumably the ages ceased to distil wisdom and mankind ceased to develop any new ideas. It is curious that of the "unkillable classics," which presumably make up the "great books," a fairly large number had to await resurrection by the educators for freedom. The list, in fact, represents a conglomeration of works in literature, philosophy, science, and mathematics. Those in the last two fields may be of interest to the historians, but have little value for the modern student of these subjects. To use a distinction made by Maritain, of the great books many may be worth "knowing about" but only a few are worth "knowing into." Certainly not all the books consist of "that portion of the past which is always present," nor do they "control thinking whenever thinking is done," whatever may be meant by "control."

The fact is that the authors of the new liberal education for freedom have completely misread the intellectual history of Europe (the culture of the rest of the world is ignored) or they could not have suggested a return to the educational canons of of the middle ages. It is significant that when men began to show an interest in studying man and the world they discarded the seven liberal arts and returned to Greek and Roman culture for guidance, and in their awakening the early humanists excoriated the type of learning cultivated in the middle ages. It is unnecessary to discuss the premise that the education of all should be the same, a concept which characterized education in the totalitarian state. In days to come the cult of the great books or "the

25. *Ibid.*, p. 81.

gospel according to St. John's" will appear to have been a piece of arrogant futility at a time when there was an urgent call for the reconstruction of education. The study of the history of education and of cultural history would have convinced the advocates of a return to the seven liberal arts that, in the words of A. N. Whitehead, "any serious fundamental change in the intellectual outlook of human society must necessarily be followed by an educational revolution."²⁶

The suggestion of a return to the medieval liberal arts and the study of certain great books, based as it also was on a concept of mental discipline and transfer of training no longer supported by modern psychology, was too easy and simple a formula for the solution of the many-sided and complex problems of contemporary education. Several phases of these problems were discussed in a series of articles on "The Function of the Liberal Arts College in a Democratic Society," which appeared in *The American Scholar*, Vol. 13, No. 4, Autumn, 1944, pp. 391 ff. The only point of agreement among the six contributors was, according to a summary by the late President William A. Neilson in the same issue, as follows: "... a common recognition that liberal education is to be found less in a prescribed list of studies than in the spirit in which these studies are taught. But after this view has been accepted there remains the harder question of how to find teachers capable of transmitting this spirit."

After dismissing the notion that certain subjects have something liberal inhering in them and the conflict between the liberal and the useful, between the cultural and utilitarian, and between literary studies and scientific or technological studies, Dr. John Dewey proposed a synthesis between these dualisms by giving technical or vocational subjects, which are now socially necessary, a humane direction. There should be an interfusion of knowledge of man and nature, of vocational preparation and a sense of the social consequences of industry on contemporary society. A liberal education should enable one to appraise his surroundings and the course of events. Dr. Alexander J. Meiklejohn pointed out that in modern society every citizen has two parts to play, and that society needs two sets of education—

26. *Op. cit.*, p. 116.

vocational preparation and an education which does not vary from man to man as a preparation for the same responsibilities and the same problems, with training in ability to make common decisions with a common passion for common truth and for common welfare. Liberal and vocational education are not identical, but a liberal education should cultivate an understanding of the place of science and technology in life today. President Scott Buchanan, on the premise that "liberal education is the same for everybody everywhere always," advocated the study of the great books. Professor Arnold S. Nash urged that the study of the humanities should be carried on not as an addendum to but within the context of a student's professional studies to give them meaning and an understanding of man, his place in society, and his relation to the universe. President Kenneth C. M. Sills urged that the function of liberal education is to free the mind, and that the experience of the race seems to demonstrate that for this purpose certain subjects (mathematics, English, foreign languages, and fine arts as the core) are more suitable than others. The function of education is to teach how to live and to make a living. Finally, Professor Ernest Earnest, in an article the title of which, "Even A.B.'s Must Eat," indicates his point of view, maintained that the liberal arts college fails to relate its work to the world which the students must face, and that a program of liberal education should be integrated with the vocational fields since "a member of a democratic society functions in that society chiefly through his occupation," and it is through an occupation or a profession that knowledge or a lack of knowledge chiefly affects society.

The Association of American Colleges, in view of the danger of a "black-out" of liberal education and a trend toward vocational training in the colleges, directed its attention to the consideration of the picture of college education in 1942. At a meeting of the Association held in Philadelphia on October 29, 1942, it was resolved that:

Whereas the vigor and continuity of liberal education are important to the health, welfare and safety of the Nation, be it resolved that a commission of the Association . . . be immediately ap-

pointed to keep continuously before the American people the wisdom of maintaining liberal education during and after the war.²⁷

It was agreed in the Commission that the conception of liberal education was not at all clear in the public mind, that during the past years there had been "less and less vigorous propagation of faith in *liberal education* on the part of educators—and more and more adjustment of the college to fit the conception of what people think they want," and that "the colleges have lost sight of the value of liberal education and their curricula have deteriorated into a hodge-podge of training in technical skills." Following a conference which was held at Princeton, February 12-14, 1943, it was decided to appoint a Committee on the Re-statement of the Nature and Aims of Liberal Education. The Committee, consisting of the following members: President Harry D. Gideonse, Brooklyn College, chairman; President W. H. Cowley, Hamilton College; Father Farrell, assistant executive director, Jesuit Educational Association; Professor Theodore M. Greene, Princeton University; Professor Charles W. Hendel, Yale University; and President James P. Baxter, III, Williams College, presented its report to the Commission on Liberal Education of the Association of American Colleges in April, 1943. The report was devoted to a discussion of "The Post-war Responsibilities of Liberal Education."²⁸

The Committee based its report on the conviction that colleges and universities

have responsibilities beyond those of answering the call of war industry or the military program of the Government. They are the custodians of a rich human heritage which they are bound by their own vows of trusteeship to keep sound and true even to enrich by intellectual inquiry, research and teaching. Along with the Government itself, the press and the churches, colleges stand among the free institutions which make up the democratic social structure of the American Commonwealth. They have their own particular duties in this free society. They owe a unique service to the individual, that he may be prepared in mind and spirit to live the democratic way of life. They can never neglect the maintenance of this

27. James P. Baxter, III, "Commission on Liberal Education Report," Association of American Colleges *Bulletin*, May, 1943, p. 269.

28. *Ibid.*, pp. 275 ff.

service, even though the world at large is suffering under the vicissitudes of war and reconstruction. The need of the nation at all times is that this work of liberal education shall be done and that men and women shall be prepared to become self-reliant and responsible citizens (pp. 275 f.).

Recognizing the general acceptance by the Princeton conference that "the contemporary problems of education cannot be solved merely by resuming the old routines at the close of the war," the Committee declared that

The solution of these problems will call for a fresh empirical approach, envisaging realistically the character, the past experience, the needs and interests of the men and women who will want such education after the war, as well as the social and economic conditions obtaining in American society at that time. Above all, a more vital concept of liberal education is required, which will serve as a guiding principle for the colleges as they strive to make higher education for the future more adequate to the needs of man in the modern world. The present critical times demand new, well-considered decision as to aim and principle and the courageous execution of the policies that are thus arrived at (p. 276).

Admitting the existence of widespread disagreement as to the nature of a liberally educated man, the Committee put forward a definition on which most people would agree; namely,

That anyone who is illiterate and inarticulate, uninformed and ignorant of the ways in which knowledge can be acquired, insensitive to man's highest values and provincial in his outlook and orientation is *not* a liberally educated person. This would suggest that men and women are liberally educated to the degree that they are *literate* and *articulate* in verbal discourse, in the languages of the arts, and in the symbolic languages of the sciences; *informed* concerning their physical, social, and spiritual environment and concerning their relationship thereto as individuals; *sensitive* to the values that endow life with meaning and significance; and able to *understand* the present in the perspective of the past and the future, and to *decide and act* as responsible moral beings (pp. 284 f.).

The purpose of a liberal education should accordingly be to help man to acquire certain human qualities that manifest themselves in characteristic habits and attitudes. It is possible to stim-

ulate and inspire the student to develop these qualities in himself. The final test of any pattern of education is the kind of men and women it produces. "What you are," said Emerson, "speaks more loudly than what you say" (p. 287).

The qualities which a liberal education should develop are freedom, self-reliance, a sense of responsibility, intellectual curiosity, fair-mindedness, open-mindedness, ability to think critically and independently, and a generous spirit in all human responses together with a readiness to recognize the worth of other persons and to deal with them in a spirit of equality. "The education of the free citizen is, in the first and largest sense, an education for both personal liberty and social responsibility." Liberal education should contribute to the development of the whole man—mind and body, character and spirit.

How these ends are to be met is answered by the Committee as follows:

The individual can best achieve this cultivation of character, mind and spirit by studying what is already known to have most worth. Civilized mankind has treasured and passed on to successive generations a precious cultural heritage. It is the capital with which men have won their way increasingly to the freedom we are still striving for today—if only to preserve it. In this heritage is a fund of proven knowledge and well-tested opinion concerning man himself and his physical and spiritual environment. It provides the long perspective of history that enables him to understand his present social and political order in the light of the past. It is also the inexhaustible many-sided record of man's persistent striving to shape historical events to his own ends—the expression of human aspirations, ideals and spiritual faiths in the forms of art, literature, ethics, philosophy and religion. These are the things man first needs to know in order to see and solve his contemporary problems. By learning what other men have thought and believed he is started on the road to his own discovery of truth, justice and good. Contact with great minds elicits the original spark of independent thought and makes him ask his own questions and solve them for himself. Thus he advances not only in learning but in the power to take care of himself in a troubled world.

The ultimate objectives of liberal education are ideals toward which man can strive but which he can never completely attain (pp. 289 f.).

The Committee elaborated a program of education in terms of specific skills and abilities, areas of knowledge, and types of integration as follows:

Skills and Abilities: Some of the most important skills and abilities which liberal education helps men and women to develop and which, in turn, are essential to the pursuit of liberal studies are the following:

- a. To speak one's language correctly and effectively; to read significant documents and to write clearly.
- b. To use at least one other language with facility.
- c. To recognize and organize facts of different types, and to interpret them coherently.
- d. To understand and appreciate great documents of art, morals and religion, and to evaluate them with imagination and wisdom.
- e. To use intelligently and with a sense of workmanship some of the principal tools and techniques of the arts and sciences.
- f. To live with others, with imaginative sympathy and understanding, and to work with them cooperatively and justly.

Areas of Knowledge: Some of the most important areas of knowledge which a person must explore to be liberally educated, and which therefore constitute the subject matter of a liberal education, are the following:

- a. The world of nature—the data, methods and achievements of the physical and biological sciences, the historical development of these sciences, their technological value, and the philosophy of science.
- b. Human society and man's interrelated social, political and economic institutions—their historical development, underlying principles and respective values for human life.
- c. American Civilization and its European background—its historical origin, its relationship to European culture, its own distinctive character and contemporary tendencies.
- d. Other cultures—primitive and advanced, oriental and occidental, and their significances.
- e. The arts and crafts—man's artistic achievements in their historical setting, and the mediums and form of artistic expression, past and present.
- f. Man himself—as a biological, psychological, moral and spiritual being; and as a member of a family and of a local, national and international community.

- g. Man's attempt, through the ages, to understand (in art and literature, philosophy and religion) what life means and how to be a responsible and useful human being (pp. 285 f.).

Types of Integration: A liberal education demands more than knowledge of a good many facts and responsiveness to various kinds of value; it requires an understanding of these in relation to one another. One type of integration is through the cultivation of an historical perspective, since "Neglect of history condemns an individual to historical provincialism; it robs him of all that he might learn from past human endeavor and compels him to plan blindly for the future." History alone is not enough. A liberal education must help man to discover those forces, peculiarly embodied in the arts and literature and in philosophy and religion, which "enable him to transcend and control history and thus to be a judge of it."

The power of such human achievements raises man's consciousness to the direct and critical appreciation of those values which are above the flux of the time process and which make a being capable of responsible judgment. A great work of art or literature, a great philosophical insight or religious belief, do not "date" or become old-fashioned, although produced in a particular time. With their aid man can achieve the essential core of a liberal education—a capacity to judge wisely and become a free and responsible agent.

A student's studies must therefore be so organized that their relations can become clear and their unity effective. For they are all one study—the study by man of man in the world in which he finds himself. A heterogeneous lot of studies, without order or sequence, produces distraction instead of comprehension. Education, to be liberal, must be cumulative and integrative. It must enable the student to achieve a sense of real accomplishment by relating the whole of reality to himself and himself to the whole. Then, and only then, will he take the responsibility for his judgments as a conscious and educated man (pp. 286 f.).

The Committee recognized, however, but only in a footnote reservation (p. 287) that "The fact that education, to be liberal, must be integrated, does not lessen the value of isolated studies." Nevertheless, it is the responsibility of sound teaching to help the student to recognize the broad relevances of whatever he studies, for, as the Committee states, the value of heterogeneous interests and studies "is greatly enhanced if they can be inte-

grated by the student into a coherent pattern of interpretation and conduct."

It was inevitable that in a proposal to revitalize the concept of liberal education, to develop new programs of instruction with new emphases, and to recognize "the perennial need of re-examination and reform" of the concept, that the Committee should concern itself with the problem of the teaching personnel. For it is the teachers who "make or unmake the best designed systems. They are the ones who apply the principles of instruction, and if they lack interest and vision, or fail to appreciate the ideas that should constantly inspire their activities, they will prevent the program from attaining its ends." The weakness of college teaching in the past has been that the advanced study of the teachers "has consisted largely of following some single departmental curriculum, as if they were solely research specialists in one line and never participants in an educational enterprise where their own subject is but one element in a balanced whole of studies." The Committee contented itself, however, with an emphasis on the importance of research, study, and scholarship to enrich teaching, but offered no suggestions for the reform of graduate study as a preparation for college teaching. It merely stated that "A discriminating choice of those who are truly qualified to carry on the postwar work of the colleges is one of the outstanding responsibilities of colleges and universities." In view of the recommendations of the Committee, it might have been more to the point to insist that this responsibility is not only an outstanding but the most important one, if education, to be liberal, is to be cumulative and integrative and not a heterogeneous lot of studies without order or sequence.

While this Committee was engaged in its deliberations and the preparation of its report, colleges throughout the country had already organized their own faculty committees to consider plans for the postwar reconstruction of the college curriculum. The same issues were considered by all the committees. Of these the first was the relation between the college and the high school, and the degree to which the former was compelled by the varying standards and requirements of the high schools to make up for the deficiencies of the entrants in what were considered to be the basic skills needed for college study, particularly

in mathematics and foreign languages. The second issue was to solve the relationship between general and specialized education. The third was the whole question of introducing order and sequence into the program of a college education, which had become chaotic as a result of the laissez-faire or elective system, and which earlier efforts at reform had failed to correct. The fourth issue was the consideration of the type of program which would provide a common background and a common language of discourse needed by educated persons in the world in which they live, and at the same time would permit the election of some studies to meet individual interests. And, finally, attention was devoted to methods of integration—whether by means of survey or orientation course, or by the adoption of such methods of instruction in each course as would help each student to see the interrelationships between the various areas of learning. To these issues no common or standard was or could be given. All that can be said is that there was agreement on general principles, but that each institution developed its own plan. The years ahead promise, unless the colleges are diverted from the intentions professed during the war years by the pressure of numbers alone, to be years of fruitful experimentation. Here it is possible to present general summaries of the plans adopted in a few institutions.

On April 5, 1944, the faculty of the College of Liberal Arts at the State University of Iowa approved a new curricular program for the college, based on more than two years of deliberation by numerous committees and subcommittees. Accepting the general principle that "the test of liberal education is the total personal growth of the individual—the richness and effectiveness of his life in all its aspects," the faculty agreed that

The primary function of the College of Liberal Arts is to provide a liberal education, that is, to encourage the student in the fullest possible development of his capacities as a person and as a member of society. The fundamental goal is the well-rounded development of the individual—intellectual, spiritual, physical, emotional, and aesthetic.

To promote these objectives the faculty recommended the following goals:

First, to assist the individual in the continued acquisition of cer-

tain abilities such as (a) the ability to speak, write, and read; (b) the ability to solve problems involving counting and calculation, (c) the ability to secure and maintain physical fitness;

Second, to guide the student toward a mastery of the leading ideas, the significant facts, the habits of thought and the methods of work in several fields such as the sciences, the social sciences, language and literature, the fine arts, history, and philosophy so that he may (a) better understand the world and the society in which he lives; (b) appreciate more fully the basic values upon which civilization and culture rest and through which they may be improved; (c) perceive and accept his responsibilities as an active participant in social groups—the family, the occupation, the community, the democratic state, and the world;

Third, to aid the student in the development of a resourceful and independent mind, the ability to use as well as to accumulate knowledge, and the awareness of his mental strength and weaknesses; and

Fourth, to provide the student with experiences which will be conducive to the development of strength of character and a sense of personal responsibility—including such personal qualities as self-reliance, perserverance, integrity, cooperation, and reverence.

The requirements for graduation, totalling 126 semester hours with a satisfactory scholarship average include: (1) Demonstration of ability, either at entrance or after enrollment in a four-semester-hour course called "Communication Skills," in basic skills of reading, writing, and speaking the English language with a degree of competency established by the staff. (2) Demonstration of ability, at entrance or by course instruction, to read or speak a foreign language. (3) Physical education (four semesters) and military science for men (four semester hours). (4) Core courses with a minimum of thirty-two semester hours required, eight each from approved core courses in (a) science; (b) social science; (c) literature; and (d) historical and cultural studies. (5) Area of concentration including (a) courses in a major department; (b) courses related to and supporting the major studies; (c) courses selected primarily for liberalizing values; no more than fifty semester hours may be from one department. (6) Elective studies up to thirty semester hours, subject to college and departmental regulations and the adviser's approval; under this provision students may combine work in dentistry, education, engineering, law, medicine, or nursing with liberal arts

and so reduce the total time required to complete general, liberal, and professional education.

The new program is flexible and "places a maximum of responsibility on intelligent personal judgment and a minimum of reliance on rules and regulations . . . For this and other reasons, the advisory program is extremely important to the success of the new plan." Accordingly, each student will be assigned an adviser at the time of his first enrollment in the College and will retain the same adviser throughout his undergraduate years unless his major changes.²⁹

In Spring, 1945, the faculty of Yale College adopted the Report of the Committee on the Course of Study, which the Committee had been in process of developing since 1940. The purpose of the Committee was to strike a reasonable balance between the successive experiments which had been tried over the last sixty years ("first, elective opportunity; second, planned breadth and distribution; and finally, concentration in the major field"), and to bring order to a situation which had been in danger of becoming chaotic. The general aims of the Committee are stated as follows:

Through its long and persistent labors, the Committee has endeavored to provide for the Yale undergraduate seeking the Bachelor of Arts degree programs of study which will equip him to live magnanimously and intellectually in the modern world. We have tried to provide curricula which will be as adequate for our times as the famous curricula of Greece, the Middle Ages, and the Renaissance were for their times. We have tried to avoid the reactionary curricula which have been publicly proposed and have gained some suffrage. We have, on the other hand, tried to strike order into the chaos of the free elective system which still finds its most notable support at the place of its origin. We have not been ashamed to take good ideas where we have found them. Our programs owe something to Mr. Hutchins, something to Mr. Stringfellow Barr, something to the so-called Progressive Colleges—Bard, Bennington, Connecticut College for Women, Sarah Lawrence, and other places. We owe ideas to such different people as President Eliot, Professor Whitehead, and Professor Dewey. But it must be insisted upon that the programs here offered are not eclectic, but are the natural de-

29. *The New Program in Liberal Arts*, University of Iowa Publications, New Series No. 1350, January 1, 1945.

velopments, as we see them, of the main traditions of Yale College. An idea has not been adopted unless it could be at home in New Haven, and a most useful citizen of our town. Finally, it must not be supposed that the Committee imagines its work done for all time. It knows, none so keenly, that the law of change operates here as in everything, and that only constant care and attention will keep the College curricula abreast of the best educational process. The Committee does believe, however, that its work has laid the foundations for a truly distinguished and distinctive program of studies, one worthy of the great traditions of Yale College.³⁰

The Committee's recommendations are strikingly different from those in other reports in that three different types of courses are suggested: (1) The Standard Plan for perhaps 85 per cent of the students; (2) The Scholars of the House Program, an honors plan for juniors and seniors only; and (3) an Experimental Program which would apply to the student from his entrance to his graduation. Of these the first was adopted to apply to freshmen entering Yale in the fall of 1946; the second will begin to operate when these freshmen reach the junior year; and the third would become operative, possibly in 1947, when there is a full, normal freshman class to draw from.

The cardinal principle of the Standard Plan is

to provide the student, in school and College, with the fundamental studies, to acquaint him with the great fields of knowledge, to make him a reasonably competent person in a limited field, and to bring him to that maturity which ought to distinguish the young graduate of Yale. The plan naturally falls into four phases, which we have called Basic Studies, Program of Distribution, the Major, and Summer Reading.³¹

The Basic Studies include English, modern language, and systematic thinking. The last of these studies, designed to meet "the need of the student for the ability to think clearly and correctly in symbols and abstractions" may be selected from courses in mathematics, philosophy, and linguistics as media for training in mathematical reasoning, logical reasoning, and linguistic reasoning respectively. The Program of Distribution is an "attempt

30. Yale College, *Report of the Committee on the Course of Study*, mimeographed, pp. 4 f.

31. *Ibid.*, p. 5.

to introduce the student to the great fields of knowledge which make up modern learning" and includes six requirements: New science courses for "the increase of human understanding"; social sciences to impress on the student "his duty and his responsibility as an active member of a democratic society"; the classics "to provide, among other things, the historical perspective which is the enemy of temporal provincialism"; literature, music, and art to bring the student "to an awareness of himself, his tastes and beliefs, his desires and satisfactions, and, above all, his connection with other men, past and present"; and philosophical, historical, and synoptic courses "to pull together the student's learning and to show him how syntheses may be made in the modern world of to-day."

In the junior and senior years the student will, as heretofore, spend half of his time in his major subject, with some time in the senior year for independent work. Finally, as an additional feature of the Standard Program is the requirement of summer reading throughout the student's career in the College.

The Scholars of the House Program "will allow the exceptionally mature and able student to set up a plan of study which will largely free him after the sophomore year from formal requirements and will permit him to work steadily at a project which he, with the help of an adviser, has planned," and which "will culminate, if he is successful, in an essay in the field of his studies which should be mature and distinguished."

Finally, the Experimental Program, elected by the student before beginning his freshman year, will be an experiment in controlled and integrated education; some thirty or forty students, a cross-section of a normal class, will be admitted to the program. "In the first year the emphasis is upon the laws and principles which operate in our natural world. In the second year the emphasis is upon the social and moral laws which bind together the individual and society." At the end of the sophomore year the student will select one of five field majors in which the work will be largely prescribed. At the end of the Experimental Program there will be a general examination on the field of the major and a senior essay will be required.

If properly qualified, students may, especially at the end of the sophomore year, pass from one program to another.

The revised plan of study for the bachelor of arts degree was adopted by the faculty of Princeton University in November, 1945, following three years of deliberation by faculty committees. The revised plan, which was to be put into operation in September, 1947, is an effort to answer the question of the proper relation between general education and academic concentration in a liberal arts program at the college level. The older emphasis had been on free choice and concentration; the newer is upon guidance and direction. Three sets of requirements are established, corresponding

to the three major stages of an undergraduate's progress toward the degree of bachelor of arts: (1) Certain requirements concerning the general education of students in their freshman and sophomore years; (2) requirements concerning divisional concentration during sophomore and junior years; and (3) requirements concerning departmental concentration during junior and senior years. The overlapping of these three phases is deliberately designed to foster closer union between the general and specialized aspects of undergraduate education.³²

The entrance requirements include among the normally required fifteen course units: (1) four years of English; (2) two years of one foreign language, ancient or modern; (3) elementary and intermediate algebra and plane geometry. Before the end of the sophomore year students will be required to reach a prescribed level of achievement in *either* a foreign language *or* mathematics. Both subjects are stressed as important aspects of a liberal education and as basic to advanced work, but students will be permitted in the first two years of college to choose one or the other according to their academic interests or future career. This provision was adopted in order to leave each student time for other important aspects of a liberal education, such as the exploration of the major fields of learning and preliminary concentration of interests in one of the academic divisions.

During the first two years students will be required to distribute course selections so as to complete two one-term courses in

32. E. Harris Harbison, "New Plan of Study for the Bachelor of Arts Degree at Princeton," *Higher Education*, U. S. Office of Education, March 1, 1946, p. 1.

each of the four following areas by the end of the sophomore year:

(1) Natural science (two courses in a single science of which one shall be a laboratory course).

(2) Social science (two courses in the social sciences other than history).

(3) Arts and letters (two courses in one or two of the following subjects: art, architecture, music, and literature, ancient or modern). . . .

(4) History, philosophy, religion (two courses). The historical courses satisfying this requirement will include courses in the following fields: (a) political, economic and cultural history, (b) history of scientific thought; (c) history of ideas as reflected in literature.³³

In the freshman year a student will select his program with the advice of a university representative and in the sophomore year with the advice of a divisional representative. In the sophomore and junior years each student will be required to elect one of three divisions—humanities, natural sciences, and social sciences—or an interdepartmental program of study in American Civilization, and to devote about half his selections to a divisional program of study culminating in a divisional examination at the end of the junior year. Each program at this stage is intended to focus the student's intellectual interests without fostering premature specialization, to acquaint him with the major problems of his chosen division, and to build a broad and firm foundation for departmental concentration.

During the junior and senior years each student will elect a department within the division already chosen and will devote his time to departmental courses, independent work, and preparation for the departmental senior comprehensive examination. Two new features of the plan are the senior seminars for high-stand men and a reduction in the normal course-load for all seniors—three courses plus independent work.

The Princeton plan was developed on the principle that the general education of the first two years should not be split from

33. *Princeton's New Plan of Study in the Liberal Arts and Sciences*, Official Register of Princeton University, Vol. XXXVII, No. 7, January 1, 1946.

the preprofessional concentration of the last two years. The student should be impressed with "the intimate relationship between general and special education, between common heritage and individual interest, between faculty guidance and student initiative." The faculty should offer clear and sometimes compelling guidance to the immature student in planning his work, but the student, as he grows in maturity, should preserve "the freedom of choice which is essential to the development of a sense of responsibility about their own education." Comparing these plans in which the two underclass years are split off from the upperclass with the Princeton plan, Professor Harbison writes:

If the educational structure resulting from these other tendencies may be compared to a broad, flat building surmounted by a skyscraper, the aim of the Princeton plan is to build an educational pyramid—with lower-class distribution as the base, divisional concentration as the converging sides, and departmental concentration as the apex.³⁴

Of all the books, articles, and reports which appeared during and immediately after the war, the most comprehensive was the report on *General Education in a Free Society*, prepared by a Harvard University faculty committee appointed in 1943 by President James Bryant Conant and published in 1945. What gives the report its unique place in recent educational literature is not the plan for the reorganization of the undergraduate curriculum at Harvard University. The proposals had already been in operation at Columbia University for more than two decades and were similar to many others which were being recommended elsewhere. The unique feature of the Harvard Report is that it presents a philosophy of education for American democracy at least from the secondary school through college. While in other reports some reference is made to the inadequate preparation of college entrants in many cases, with suggestions of the need of remedial or "repair" courses, the Harvard Report devotes special attention to the problems both of the secondary school and of the college.

The terms of reference of the Committee appointed in 1943

34. *Loc. cit.*, p. 3.

are stated in President Conant's *Annual Report* to the Board of Overseers on January 11, 1943, as follows:

In the meantime I am taking the liberty of appointing a University Committee on "The Objectives of a General Education in a Free Society." This Committee, composed of members of several faculties, including Arts and Sciences and Education, I hope will consider the problem at both the school and the college level. For surely the most important aspect of this whole matter is the general education of the great majority of each generation—not the comparatively small minority who attend our 4-year colleges. . . .

As has been brought out so often in discussions of this Board, the heart of the problem of a general education is the continuance of the liberal and humane tradition. Neither the mere acquisition of information nor the development of special skills and talents can give the broad basis of understanding which is essential if our civilization is to be preserved. No one wishes to disparage the importance of being "well-informed." But even a good grounding in mathematics and the physical and biological sciences, combined with an ability to read and write several foreign languages, does not provide a sufficient educational background for citizens of a free Nation. For such a program lacks contact with both man's emotional experience as an individual and his practical experience as a gregarious animal. It includes little of what was once known as the wisdom of the ages, and might now be described as "our cultural pattern." It includes no history, no art, no literature, no philosophy. Unless the educational process includes, *at each level of maturity*, some continuing contact with those fields in which value judgments are of prime importance, it must fall far short of the ideal. The students in high school, in college and in graduate school must be concerned, in part, at least, with the words "right" and "wrong" in both the ethical and the mathematical sense. Unless he feels the import of those general ideas and aspirations, which have been a deep moving force in the lives of men, he runs the risk of partial blindness.

There is nothing new in such educational goals; what is new in this century in the United States is their application to a system of universal education. Formal education based on "book learning" was once only the possession of a professional class; in recent times it becomes more widely valued because of social implications. The restricted nature of the circle possessing certain linguistic and historical knowledge greatly enhanced the prestige of this knowledge. "Good taste" could be standardized in each generation by those who knew. But, today, we are concerned with a general education—a

liberal education—not for the relatively few, but for a multitude.

The primary concern of American education today is not the development of the appreciation of the “good life” in young gentlemen born to the purple. It is the infusion of the liberal and humane tradition into our entire educational system. Our purpose is to cultivate in the largest possible number of our future citizens an appreciation of both the responsibilities and the benefits which come to them because they are Americans and are free.³⁵

The Harvard Committee wisely recognized that the foundations of education for membership in a free society must be laid as early as possible, and that college education itself must fail in the long run unless the principles upon which it is based are applied equally to the education of all to the degree that they are capable of profiting thereby. Thus the Committee ventured “into the vast field of American educational experience in quest of a concept of general education that would have validity for the free society which we cherish.”

The Committee in entering upon this venture took into consideration most of the issues which have been accumulating in American education since the beginning of the century and more particularly in the past twenty-five years—the changing character of the high school and college clientele, the vast development of knowledge, the danger of intense specialization, and the complex problems of American society.

Discussing the question of equality of opportunity, the Committee boldly attempted to reconcile the Jeffersonian and Jacksonian principles in the American tradition. Realizing that the function of the high school is no longer to prepare for college but for life, the Committee declared that

democracy is not only opportunity for the able. It is equally betterment of the average, both the immediate betterment which can be gained in a single generation and the slower ground-swell of betterment which works through generations. Hence the task of the high school is not merely to speed the bright boy to the top. It is at least as much (so far as numbers are concerned, far more) so to widen the horizons of ordinary students that they and, still more,

35. The above analysis, with some modifications, appeared as a review of the report in *School and Society*, Vol. 62, December 1, 1945, pp. 356 ff.

their children will encounter fewer of the obstacles that cramp achievement (p. 11).

[For] whether you interpret democracy as political democracy protecting the rights of the individual or as economic democracy protecting opportunity for the mass, there is a point at which the two views meet: namely, that opportunity means nothing unless it is opportunity for good, which in turn depends on some experience of the good . . . (p. 22).

[Hence] we understand by democracy the interworking of two complementary forces, the Jeffersonian and the Jacksonian, the one valuing opportunity as the nurse of excellence, the other as the guard of equity (p. 33).

The main task, then, of the American education system is "to nurture ability while raising the average," for "leadership is inseparable from its following, and both from common standards." Here is the answer to those who argue that secondary education should concern itself wholly with the 80 per cent of students not proceeding to college and who would leave the 20 per cent to fend more or less for themselves. The Committee presents still another answer when, by way of general summary, it states:

It was remarked democracy, by broadening the basis of government to include all the people, ideally demands of all the education formerly reserved for the privileged class. The distinction has ceased between inferiors trained only for practical tasks and superiors broadly trained for government. The Renaissance collegiate education was, in effect, precisely an education of governors—men rounded and supple enough to make decisions and sufficiently well educated to do so with perspective and a sense of standards. It is the mantle of this tradition which has descended on the modern college—even to some degree on the modern high school. Since the governor is now the citizen and no longer merely the gentleman and the aristocrat, then this "gentleman's education" has become the citizen's education. The Puritan influence mentioned above was a step in this direction. It is an education which looks first of all to general responsibility and competence among an increasingly large group (p. 244).

Accordingly, "the task of modern democracy is to preserve the ancient ideal of liberal education and to extend it as far as possible to all members of the community"—instead of rejecting it because at one time it "went with the structure of the aristo-

cratic ideal." In the light of these statements it is difficult to understand why the Committee preferred to publish its report under the title "General Education . . ." rather than "Liberal Education in a Free Society." Liberal education has a tradition which has, it is true, too often been misinterpreted, but "general education" of the kind recommended by the Committee lends itself too easily to confusion with that "general education" which was the slogan a few years ago and was so "general" as to be nothing in particular.

The function of education, then, is to "help young persons fulfill the unique, particular functions in life which it is in them to fulfill, and fit them so far as it can for those common spheres which, as citizens and heirs of a joint culture, they will share with others." Some provision must be made for differences of interests and abilities, yet democracy "depends equally on the binding-ties of common standards. It probably depends more heavily on these ties than does any other kind of society precisely because the divisive forces within it are strong." The program of education must provide for unity and diversity, for special and general education, "for these subjects which divide man from man according to their particular functions and for those which unite man and man in their common humanity and citizenship." And the latter is of greater concern today because of the staggering expansion of knowledge, the growth of the educational system, and the ever-growing complexity of society itself. The major issue is to find the desired unity, "the binding, integrative working of general education to check and countercheck its [the educational system's] inevitable divisiveness."

The Committee examined and rejected four plans to promote intellectual unity: religion which "is not now for most colleges a practicable source of intellectual unity;" "the tradition of Western culture as embodied in the great writings of the European and American past;" concentration "on actual problems and questions which young people may be expected to meet in mature life—health, vocation, family, social issues, private standards, and the like;" and the pragmatist solution which "sees in science and the scientific outlook this saving unity." The Committee stated its own views as follows:

Thus the search continues and must continue for some over-all logic, some strong, not easily broken frame within which both college and school may fulfill their at once diversifying and uniting task. This logic must be wide enough to embrace the actual richness and variegation of modern life—a richness partly, if not wholly, reflected in the complexity of our present educational system. It must also be strong enough to give goal and direction to this system—something much less clear at present. It is evidently to be looked for in the character of American society, a society not wholly of the new world since it came from the old, not wholly given to innovation since it acknowledges certain fixed beliefs, not even wholly a law unto itself since there are principles above the state. This logic must further embody certain intangibles of the American spirit, in particular, perhaps, the ideal of cooperation on the level of action irrespective of agreement on ultimates—which is to say, belief in the worth and meaning of the human spirit, however one may understand it. Such a belief rests on that hard but very great thing, tolerance not from absence of standards but through possession of them (p. 40 f.).

There must, accordingly, be developed through education a sense of heritage, for our culture

depends in part on an inherited view of man and society which it is the function, though not the only function, of education to pass on. . . . To study either past or present is to confront, in some form or another, the philosophic and religious fact of man in history and to recognize the huge continuing influence alike on past and present of the stream of Jewish and Greek thought in Christianity. There is doubtless a sense in which religious education, education in great books, and education in modern democracy may be mutually exclusive. But there is a far more important sense in which they work together to the same end, which is belief in man and society that we inherit, adapt, and pass on. . . . [For] it is impossible to escape the realization that our society, like any society, rests on common beliefs and that a major task of education is to perpetuate them (pp. 45 f.).

To those who would object that to cultivate the tradition of culture would militate against change and experiment, the Committee's reply was that

an axiom of that tradition itself is the belief that no current form of the received ideal is final but that every generation, indeed every individual, must discover it in a fresh form. Education can therefore be wholly devoted neither to tradition nor to experiment, neither to the belief that the ideal in itself is enough nor to the view that means are valuable apart from the ideal. It must uphold at the same time tradition and experiment, the ideal and the means, subserving, like our culture itself, change within commitment (p. 51).

It follows from these principles that general education must be viewed as "an organic whole whose parts join in expounding a ruling idea and in serving a common aim. And to do so means to abandon the view that all fields and all departments are equally valuable vehicles of general education. It also implies some prescription." The key question, therefore, is "how can general education be so adapted to different ages and, above all, differing abilities and outlooks, that it can appeal deeply to each, yet remain in goal and essential teaching the same for all?"

General education, therefore, in both secondary school and college should be built up on three areas of learning—natural science, social studies, and the humanities—as three different methods of knowledge to direct "the students' attention to the useful truth that man must familiarize himself with the environment in which nature has placed him if he is to proceed realistically with the task of achieving the good life." The reconciliation of the conflicting views which have agitated American education for the past generation is to be found in the Committee's belief

that our society and culture have indeed laid hold on common truths, knowledge of which is necessary for anything like a good and useful life, yet that, since our hold on truth is incomplete, we must forever look to new insights leading to change. Our argument, then, is that knowledge is dangerous and illiberal if it does not embrace as fully as possible the mainsprings of our culture (p. 106).

The Committee did not ignore that aspect of the whole problem which is fundamental to the success of a theory of education, however sound it may be. It recognized that "everything finally depends on the teacher's quality of mind and spirit," that "surely the hope of a sound general education is in teachers who are themselves generally educated;" and that one of the needs of

schools and colleges is "above all, perhaps, a more rounded, longer, more continuing education of teachers." But only the problem and the conditions for its solution were stated, and then only for high school teachers; no suggestions were offered, except by implication, of a new scheme for teacher preparation. If general education at the college level is to succeed, the problem of preparing college teachers will also become serious. To this problem the Committee referred only indirectly; first, in stating that "the difficulty in designing a course in great literature for all students" lies in the fact that "the modes of treatment proper to the specialist are a distraction to those who are not to become experts;" and second, repeating the idea in still another form, "Yet the fact remains that the present system favors a specialism which only the strong teacher breaks through." If the result of intense specialization in graduate schools is "that each subject, being taught by an expert, tends to be so presented as to attract potential experts," then this fact points only in one direction—that the current requirements for the Ph.D., which are responsible for the specialism, are everywhere due for revision. The Committee might have gone further and emphasized the fact that in the long run it will not be the curriculum which it suggested, nor any other curriculum, which will produce free men in a democracy, but teachers who are fully aware of the purposes which the areas of their responsibility are intended to serve. An authoritarianism which some critics of the program of general education may profess to find in the report can only be avoided to the degree that teachers at all levels of education recognize the abilities to be developed. These the report defined as abilities "to think effectively, to communicate thought, to make relevant judgments, to discriminate among values." The Committee, aware that it might lay itself open to criticism because of its emphasis on intellectual abilities and the sway of reason, protected itself, but perhaps too mildly, against another school of thought, with the statement that

while traditionally man has been viewed as a rational animal, recent thinking has called attention to his unconscious desires and sentiments which becloud and sometimes sway his reason. To be sure, classical philosophers recognized the existence of passions, but they

tended to regard the latter as alien intrusions and an unwanted complication. Yet, passions, although dangerous because primitive and even savage, are a source of strength if properly guided; they supply the driving forces for achievement (p. 168).

The theory of general education expounded by the Committee led it to recommend three areas of learning—natural science, social studies, and the humanities—each of which is defined as follows:

The study of natural sciences looks to an understanding of our physical environment, so that we may have a suitable relation to it. The study of the social sciences is intended to produce an understanding of our social environment and of human institutions in general, so that the student may achieve a proper relation to society—not only the local but also the great society, and, by the aid of history, the society of the past and even of the future. Finally, the purpose of the humanities is to enable man to understand man in relation to himself, that is to say, in his inner aspirations and ideals (pp. 58 f.).

A rigid separation between the first and last two years of the undergraduate course is not contemplated, since "General education is the appreciation of the organic complex of relationships which gives meaning and point to the specialty. To some degree it should suffuse all special education." The Committee recommended that of the sixteen courses required for the bachelor's degree, six courses in general education should be required, of which at least one shall be in the humanities, one in the social sciences, and one in the sciences. In the first two of these areas courses will be prescribed to "furnish the common core, the body of learning and of ideas which would be a common experience of Harvard students as well as introductions to the study of the traditions of Western culture and to the consideration of general relationships." In the sciences alternative courses would be established to meet individual differences of interests and competence in dealing with mathematical and scientific material. The three further courses required for general education may be selected from a wide range of courses approved by the Committee on General Education proposed in the report. The courses selected should not be in the student's particular department of concentration. The courses designed to meet the general education requirements would not be "mammoth introductory, and cer-

tainly not survey courses." Of the two groups of requirements the Committee recommended that two be taken in the freshman year and the third in the second year, with the idea that "The broad scope of these courses would be particularly helpful to the student who is preparing to choose a field of concentration." The second group need not be taken at any particular time, but it is proposed that they be taken in the junior and senior years, "when the student is more mature, in command of a larger vocabulary and a greater body of learning, and is able to appreciate on a more advanced level some of the principles, values, and relationships which are of special importance in the promotion of the aims with which we are concerned. General education should not be confused with elementary education."

The Report on *General Education in a Free Society* is a contribution not only to the reorganization of the undergraduate course at Harvard, but a reasoned philosophy of education appropriate to American democracy. The Committee did not fail to consider plans and suggestions that had already gained a great deal of notoriety; but of its own efforts the following statement is the best appraisal:

An extreme and one-sided view easily calls attention to itself and gains fervent adherents; but a balanced view is apt to be less immediately striking. Reasonableness does not lend itself to exciting conclusions because it aims to do justice to the whole truth in all its shadings. By the same token, reasonableness may legitimately hope to attain at least to part of the truth (p. 176).

The general theory underlying proposals and plans for the reorganization of college education had already been adopted at Columbia College for twenty-five years. Continued discussion and experimentation resulted in the development of three courses—Contemporary Civilization, Humanities, and the Sciences—required to be taken by all freshmen and sophomores. In *A College Program in Action, A Review of Working Principles at Columbia College*, published in 1946, the Committee on Plans, which prepared the review, states that "We have a warrantable pride in the fact that the 'new plans' that are opening before many of our best-known colleges are paths that we have first explored and then traveled with familiarity" (p. 4).

At Columbia College there is a sharp division between the underclass and upperclass courses, which the Committee justifies as follows:

There is much room for debate whether the line of division between the first two and last two years should be so sharp as to bring about two distinct types of study and academic life. Even though with us a "required course" does not imply standardized indoctrination, but only a common body of readings and topics for discussion, still there is no reason to doubt that a senior should be doing a work of greater maturity in type, range, and imaginative appeal. The present Committee is in accord with that view. It also supports the conclusion of the former committee that the pattern of general conformity in the work of the first two years should be replaced in the last two years by reasonably free election, and that this free choice should follow no uniform plan of synthesis, arbitrary unity, specialization, or other prescribed principle, but should be worked out in the best possible understanding of the particular student's needs and capacities (pp. 5 f.).

There is no doubt that the deliberations of the war years represent an important stage in the reform of the college curriculum.³⁶ Whether the plans can be put into operation successfully in view of the preoccupation with the needs of veterans and the shortage of teachers is a serious question. The years ahead will undoubtedly be years of experimentation and, while the fundamental theory of general or liberal education will probably be established, different patterns for implementing it will be elaborated. Not the least important problem that still remains to be

36. The only opposition to the new programs appears to have been expressed in a *Report of the Curriculum Committee Adopted by the Faculty of the College of Arts and Sciences* of Buffalo. The Committee's statement of the Objectives of the College of Arts and Sciences does not differ from other statements on the same subject. The Committee, however, reaffirmed the principle of free electives and, since it considered prescription of courses in any form as authoritarian, was led "to prefer the apparent confusion of freedom to an imposed order" (p. 22). The Committee stated further that "In all of this, we feel that the psychology of the student is important. However much one may protest that he should be humble and follow the direction of his elders and betters, it is a fact that omnibus and sumptuary requirements of any sort make him feel cornered, and add to his effort of learning the burden of putting a restraint upon his sense of injustice" (p. 24). See *The University of Buffalo Studies*, Vol. 18, June, 1946, No. 1.

solved is concerned with the type of preparation that should be given to future college teachers. The answer may perhaps be found in a reduction of the emphasis on research and the advancement of knowledge which conduce to specialization and more on scholarship, which should imply breadth and a comprehension of the interrelationship of various areas of learning. An important contribution to this end may be found in the development of areas of study and of interdisciplinary courses. In addition, the fact that the majority of graduate students intend to enter the teaching profession may lead to the provision of some plans to initiate them into the problems that they will have to face as teachers.

NEW INTERESTS AND NEW DIRECTIONS

The urgent need of the armed forces for officers with a mastery of foreign languages to deal not only with prisoners of war but also with the people in occupied areas, and the new role that the United States is destined to play in international affairs exercised an important and profound influence on the development of new interests and new directions in education both at the secondary and at the higher levels. The study of foreign languages, not only the usual languages found in the curricula of high schools, colleges, and universities but also "unusual" languages in which instruction was provided only rarely or not at all, was recognized both during and after the war as of great importance both for the promotion of international understanding and for the advancement of international relations whether in politics or in business.

The search for candidates with an oral mastery of foreign languages threw a flood of light on the inadequacy of the instruction given in high schools and colleges in the usual languages such as French, German, Spanish, and Italian. There were a number of reasons to explain the situation. The emphasis in language teaching, based on the recommendations of the Modern Language Inquiry of the twenties had been on the development of reading ability. In the competition for students in a rapidly expanding list of subjects offered both in high schools and in colleges, interest in the study of languages declined. The promotion of the Good Neighbor Policy in the thirties resulted in an increase in

the number of students who studied Spanish, but too often this was at the expense of other languages included in the curriculum.

In a search for candidates with ability to speak a foreign language with a view to appointment as intelligence officers, Major Francis Millet Rogers, after interviewing fifteen officer candidates at Quantico, found that none of them could speak German, although they had studied the language for two years in high school and three years in college. After interviewing 120 enlisted men whose records indicated possible language skills, and of whom some held the M.A. or Ph.D. degree, Major Rogers selected fourteen interpreters who were refugees, immigrants, or the children of immigrants, who had heard a foreign language spoken at home.³⁷ The situation was, of course, still worse when interpreters had to be found for Russian, Japanese and Chinese, and a host of unusual languages. The situation demanded the development of new methods and new techniques to meet new and wholly unforeseen requirements.

The inadequate provision of instruction in the lesser known languages had, however, not been ignored. Mortimer Graves, administrative secretary of the American Council of Learned Societies, had for some years sought to promote through the Council the teaching of languages not usually found in American curricula—not only Chinese, Japanese, and Russian, but Oriental languages in general. In 1940 Mr. Graves and others planned the creation of a National School of Modern Oriental Languages. On the approval of the plan by the Executive Committee of the Council and the formation of a Committee on the School of Modern Oriental Languages and Civilizations, grants were secured from the Rockefeller Foundation and a start was made with the development of teachers and teaching materials for intensive instruction in modern languages not usually taught in American schools and colleges. In the summer of 1941 two institutes were held, one at Cornell University on Chinese and Japanese, and the other at Princeton University on Arabic and Islamic Studies. As a result of discussions held at Cornell University, Navy Language Schools were established at Harvard University and the

37. "Languages and the War Effort: a Challenge to Teachers of Modern Foreign Languages," *The Modern Language Journal*, May, 1943, pp. 299 ff.

University of California, later concentrated at the University of Colorado. It was early recognized that there was a great need to provide tools for the study of the languages which were already or would be in demand—textbooks, reading materials, recordings, and dictionaries.

It was decided from the start that the emphasis should be on oral mastery of the languages taught, and that the method developed by Professors Franz Boas, Edward Sapir, and Leonard Bloomfield for learning and teaching American Indian languages would lend itself best for purposes of what came to be known as the "Intensive Language Program." The method involved the cooperation of trained linguists with native speakers, later referred to as "informants." Although developed for learning and teaching languages in which textbooks and other materials were not available, the method was later applied to other languages in which such materials existed but which were not adapted to the immediate purposes of the Intensive Language Program. The method was described briefly by Dr. Mary R. Haas, who herself undertook to apply it to learning and teaching Thai, one of the earliest undertakings of the Program. Answering the question, "Is there then no method for learning a difficult language without adequate textbooks and trained teachers?" Dr. Haas wrote as follows:

The answer is an inspiring one: any language can be learned, quickly and correctly, by a trained linguist working with a native speaker, whom he treats not as a teacher but purely as a source of information. The linguist is thoroughly trained in phonetics and in grammatical analysis; in the most favorable case he has already analyzed one or more languages before he approaches the one to be learned. His method is simple. He persuades his informant (the native speaker) to talk in the foreign language; he listens carefully, and writes down what the informant says in a phonetic alphabet which he converts as soon as possible into a practical orthography (phonemic transcription); he compares and analyzes the forms of the new language; and classifies them in terms of its own grammatical system, without reference to the grammar of English or of any other language previously known to him. Moreover, the linguist imitates everything the informant says, and keeps on imitating until the informant is completely satisfied with his pronuncia-

tion; it is by this means that he learns the language—not by asking the informant how he makes this or that sound, or why he speaks a sentence in this way and not in that.³⁸

Work on the development of the Intensive Language Program was undertaken in 1941-42 with a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation. It was administered under the auspices of the American Council of Learned Societies, by two committees of the Council—the Committee on the National School of Modern Oriental Languages and Civilizations and the Committee on Intensive Language Instruction jointly—and was under the general supervision of Mortimer Graves, chairman of the first committee and secretary of the second. In April, 1942, J. M. Cowan, professor of German at the University of Iowa and secretary of the Linguistic Society of America, was appointed director in charge of the operation of the Program. Of the two committees the first was more concerned with the scientific features for implementing instruction in the languages, and the second more with the provision of courses of instruction; but there was no rigorous division of functions between the two committees.

An intensive language course was defined as a course which occupied the full-time of the students, generally computed at fifteen hours of classroom instruction, fifteen hours of drill instruction with native speakers, and twenty to thirty hours of individual preparation a week. It was found that the best results were achieved in the shortest time by two or three six-week sessions, separated by short intervals of rest.

The major task for those in charge of the Intensive Language Programs was to provide an adequate personnel for instruction and materials for instruction—grammars, textbooks, phonograph recordings, dictionaries, etc., which were not available for the large number of languages in the program, and when available, as, for example, in Chinese, Japanese, Russian, and Portuguese, were not suitable for the particular method of instruction adopted. Another serious difficulty was the dearth of native speakers or informants in some of the lesser known languages. By diligent search, however, some were discovered. Experiments

38. "The Linguist as a Teacher of Languages," *Language*, July-September, 1943, pp. 203 ff.

were begun with the method described above and proved to be successful. Two manuals were prepared for the use of teachers and students: *An Outline Guide to the Practical Study of Foreign Languages* by Leonard Bloomfield, and *Outline of Linguistic Analysis* by Bernard Bloch and George L. Trager.

From this point on the teaching of foreign languages was by the new methods, the novel features of which promised "when employed by competent scholars with imagination and critical reserve who are not mere adepts at a technique, to yield quite revolutionary dividends, particularly with respect to instruction in those languages not already well studied and well known."³⁹ The scope of the program was gradually extended and included instruction in the following languages: African (Swahili, Fanti, Hausa, Moroccan Arabic, Pidgin English, Amharic, Somali, and Afrikaans); Arabic (Moroccan, Egyptian, Syro-Palestinian, and Iraqi); Burmese; Chinese (Cantonese, Sino-Japanese, and Mandarin); Modern Greek; Hindustani; Hungarian, Iranian; Japanese; Korean, Kurdish; Malay; Pashtu; Pidgin English (Melanesian); Portuguese; Panjabi; Russian; Thai; and Turkish.

Referring to the reluctance on the part of university administrators to depart from the traditional arrangement in offering language courses and the criticism that the new courses were "practical" and "non-academic," Graves and Cowan wrote:

To the extent that this intensive work is designed to provide tool-competence in languages to be used by specialists in disciplines other than languages, linguistics, and literature, the criticism, if it be one, is valid. The sponsors of the Program, however, see no mutual exclusiveness in the terms "practical" and "scientific." They believe that (1) a practical tool-command of a language is the best foundation of scientific or academic work in it, (2) that such practical command can be secured most efficiently in the intensive course, and (3) that all instruction which is not based on scientific analysis of the language question is inefficient. They are willing to contend, consequently, that their operations are not only "practical" and "scientific," but even "academic." Recently there seems to be a swing of attitude in the direction of favoring sound experimentation

39. Mortimer Graves and J. M. Cowan, *Report of the First Year's Operation of the Intensive Language Program of the American Council of Learned Societies*, 1941-1942, Washington, D. C., 1942, p. 6.

with intensive language instruction in French, Spanish, German, and Italian.⁴⁰

After Pearl Harbor the immediate practical need for training language specialists predominated, and it was fortunate that the experimentation with the Intensive Language Program had proceeded far enough to provide a ready method to meet this need. Numerous departments of government—Office of Strategic Services, Board of Economic Warfare, Department of Justice—and of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps turned to the officials in charge of the Program for advice and cooperation. The method was adopted by the Army Specialized Training Program, by the Navy, and by the Civil Affairs Division of the Provost Marshall's Office in its Civil Affairs Training Schools (CATS). The experience of the Program gradually led to its development into a Program of Regional Studies. The combination of language and regional studies was indicated particularly in the adoption by the CATS of the Foreign Area and Language Study Curriculum (FALSC). Another development which emerged from the Program resulted from a Conference by Mr. Graves with the Joint Army-Navy Committee on Recreation and Welfare, when it was decided to produce teaching materials available to troops for learning in their spare time the principal first phases which a soldier might need in a foreign country. Small booklets with two double-faced phonograph recordings of their content were published in about fifty languages by the Education Branch, Special Supply Division, Services of Supply of the U. S. Army in co-operation with the U. S. Armed Forces Institute (USAFI).

Two important contributions were made by the Intensive Language Program. The first of these was "the increased experiment with and advertising of intensive methods, improvement of implementation, and scientific study of linguistic phenomena; much of this last not only for the first time in America but for the first time anywhere in the world." The second contribution was the extension of the Program in some centers to include regional studies as well as language instruction, thus described:

For example, instead of developing a centre for the study of *Turkish*, we should develop a centre for the study of *Turkey*. In

40. *Ibid.*, p. 23.

such a development, obviously, language is the central core, but it should be surrounded by the disciplines of history, the social and natural sciences, and those studies which deal with the human being and his relation to his environment, physical and social.⁴¹

The Intensive Language Program aroused widespread interest throughout the country, both among the lay public and among professional teachers of languages. Public imagination was aroused by sensational accounts in the press and magazines of the discovery of a miraculous method whereby languages could be learned in a hurry. Those responsible for the development of the Program never made any other claim for it than that it was intensive and required concentration of time and effort. Professional language teachers resented the implication that they had failed to produce results and pointed to the fact that teachers in the Program were drawn from their own group and succeeded not only because of concentration of time and effort, but because of small classes and availability of materials too expensive to be used under normal conditions. There were also technical criticisms that insufficient attention was devoted to grammar, reading, and writing, but on the whole such criticisms were a result of misunderstanding what was actually done.

A special committee appointed by the Commission on Trends in Education of the Modern Language Association published a report in 1944 of "A Survey of Language Classes in the Army Specialized Training Program." The committee, after describing the various aspects of the methods involved, came to the following conclusions:

For the purpose of this report the results of language teaching in the ASTP may be considered fairly only for those trainees who had had no previous recognizable experience in hearing or speaking the foreign language which they were studying.

Regarding the achievements of the trainees on this basis, the survey staff found that for a very considerable number of trainees the results, while by no means miraculous, were definitely good, very satisfactory to the men in charge of the program, and very generally gratifying to the trainees themselves. Wherever the staff found careful and appropriate organization and coordination of teaching procedures, capable senior instructors and drill-masters,

41. *Ibid.*, p. 32.

adequate supervision and control of the work, and skill and resourcefulness in the construction and adaptation of teaching materials, encouraging and worthwhile results were achieved. In short, a considerable per cent of the trainees did acquire the ability to express themselves with fluency and reasonable accuracy in the foreign language which they were speaking for the first time, including a good pronunciation, and a high level of ability to understand the spoken language as employed by different native speakers under circumstances representing normal speaking conditions.

There is considerable evidence, too, that the consistent and intensive use of the oral approach by no means eliminated the opportunity to acquire reading ability. In view of the great amount and variety of printed materials actually used by the trainees in preparing for oral practice of one kind or another, as well as for extra-curricular and purely recreational purposes, silent reading ability, while it was not an announced objective of the program, undoubtedly was generally acquired to a very appreciable extent. This impression on the part of the survey staff was supported quite generally by the university men in charge of the language programs at the institutions visited, as well as by deans and faculty members from other departments.⁴²

The Intensive Language Program, if it demonstrated nothing else, did prove that American students do not lack the aptitude for learning to speak foreign languages, even allowing for the special motivation of preparing for a greatly needed service. It also demonstrated that oral mastery of a foreign language demands concentration of time and effort. Whether some of the methods and devices developed by the Program itself and its application to the needs of the armed forces can be employed under the conditions of a normal academic program, and what modifications must be introduced, was made the subject of investigation immediately after the end of the war. Three institutions, Yale University, the University of Chicago, and Cornell University, undertook to experiment both with the application and the necessary modifications. Undoubtedly important contributions will result for the teaching of foreign languages in the future.

42. *A Survey of Language Classes in the Army Specialized Teaching Program*, Modern Language Association of America, New York, 1944, pp. 25 f. See also "Army Specialized Training Program Issue," *The German Quarterly*, November, 1944.

For specialists in this field a solution may perhaps be found in the organization of intensive programs in an extended summer session, a suggestion made by the Columbia College committee in its report on *A College in Action*, or as offered for some years at Middlebury College.

Of equal importance with the method of language teaching is the recognition that the study of a foreign language should lead to an understanding of the culture of the people who speak it. The development of regional or area language studies may stimulate modern language departments to broaden their courses along the lines indicated on pp. 236 f.

The new emphasis had, in fact, already begun to be recognized as a result of new interest which has been aroused by the role of the United States in international affairs. To Latin American studies, which had already secured an established position in the years preceding the war, there began to be added Chinese, Japanese, and Russian studies and courses in international relations, all of which have been organized in the larger universities and some in smaller colleges.

One unanticipated result of the idea of regional or area studies in the study of foreign languages has been the more rapid development of courses in American civilization and culture, which had already been introduced at the graduate level before the war at George Washington University in 1936, Harvard University and the University of Minnesota in 1937, and the University of Pennsylvania in 1939. By the end of 1946 no standardized programs had been elaborated. In some institutions the program sought to combine American literature and history; in others it was organized in the form of departmental majors and minors with or without an integrating course or seminar. Experiments of different kinds will continue to be tried out.

The ultimate success of the programs of regional or area studies in American or any other civilization and culture will depend upon the development of a system of interdisciplinary studies at the graduate level, but in this development only faint beginnings have been made. Departments are still too strongly entrenched to make the coordination and selection of content for such courses feasible.

CHAPTER SEVEN

EDUCATION AND THE ARMED FORCES

PLANS FOR THE EDUCATION OF VETERANS

A FEW WEEKS after the attack on Pearl Harbor the responsibility of the government for establishing opportunities for the continued nonmilitary education of men and women in the armed forces was recognized. A few months later the equally important responsibility for providing opportunities for education to prepare the military personnel for readjustment to civilian life or for further education after the end of the war began to be discussed.

Plans to carry out the first responsibility were adopted in December, 1941, by the War Department through the organization of a recreational and educational program for military personnel during periods free from military duties or off-duty time. The task was assigned to the Morale Service Division, which was activated in December, 1941, and whose name was changed in March, 1942, to the Special Service Division of the War Department. The Division was placed under the charge of Brigadier General (later Major General) Frederick H. Osborn, who had been chairman of the President's Advisory Committee on Selective Service (1940) and chairman of the Joint Army and Navy Committee on Welfare and Recreation (1941). Colonel Francis T. Spaulding, dean of the Graduate School of Education, Harvard University, was appointed chief of the Education Branch of the Division.

In order to provide opportunities for continued nonmilitary education of men and women in the armed forces after completing the period of basic training, the Army Institute, later known as the United States Armed Forces Institute (USAFI), was established in Madison, Wisconsin. The Institute administered correspondence courses directly and entered into contracts with extension divisions of colleges and universities to make their own courses available to military personnel. Courses were provided

for those who desired high school or college credit. The only charge to soldier students taking the courses of USAFI was a registration fee of \$2.00. For correspondence courses taken through colleges and universities the government paid half of the tuition fees not exceeding \$20 for any one course. Applications for the latter courses had to be cleared through USAFI. By the middle of 1944 USAFI offered 275 courses and the 83 colleges and universities which entered into contracts with the Institute offered about 7,000 courses. Of those enrolled 75 per cent took the Institute courses and 25 per cent the courses made available by colleges and universities. USAFI prepared self-teaching textbooks and issued special paperbound editions of standard textbooks. In September, 1942, the services of USAFI were extended to the navy, marine corps, and coast guard. By February 1, 1946, in the education program offered during off-duty time, approximately 800,000 service men enrolled for correspondence and self-teaching courses and 1,000,000 enrolled for classes organized and conducted on Army installations.

The objectives of USAFI were defined, when the Institute was established, as follows:

a. To provide continuing educational opportunities to meet the requirements of the command; in particular, (1) To furnish assistance to personnel who lack educational prerequisites for assignment to duty which they are otherwise qualified to perform, and (2) To assist individual soldiers in meeting requirements for promotion.

b. To enable those whose education is interrupted by military service to maintain relations with educational institutions, and thus increase the probability of the completion of their education upon their return to civil life.¹

Upon the completion of each course a certificate of proficiency was sent to the soldier student through his commanding officer and entered on the "Soldier's Qualification Card." In order to provide high schools and colleges with data on the military training and experience for purposes of evaluation in terms of academic credit and to provide employers accurate descriptions of

1. *Education for Victory*, January 15, 1943, p. 19. See also issues for April 15, 1942, p. 15, and August 3, 1944, p. 9.

the skills acquired and training received by service personnel, USAFI set up an accreditation service. Reports were made available to servicemen who filled out a form, "Request for Report on Educational Achievement." The Institute, however, did not itself assume responsibility for evaluating, recommending, or granting credit. The examination staff of the Institute prepared three types of examinations as follows:

1. The "end-of-the-course examination," specially designed for use with a particular course—correspondence, self-teaching, or group instruction, and administered to the men while they are in the service.
2. The "field" or "subject" examination, designed to fit as closely as possible the content of a standard elementary school, high school, or college course. These examinations will be standardized on nation-wide samplings, and these norms made available.
3. "Tests of general educational development," designed especially to provide a measure of the general educational development resulting from all the possibilities for informal self-education which military service involves as well as the general educational growth incidental to military training and experience.²

Accreditation proved to be an important service when veterans began to return and to seek admission to high schools, colleges, and universities.

The second problem, that of developing programs for the education or adjustment to civilian life of returning veterans, began to be discussed a few months after the United States had entered the war. On April 10, 1942, the Institute of Adult Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, appointed a Commission on Postwar Training and Adjustment which published a *Statement of Principles Relating to the Educational Problems of Returning Soldiers, Sailors, and Displaced War Industry Workers*.³ In July, 1942, following informal discussions of the postwar education of veterans by a group representing governmental and private agencies in the offices of the American Council on Education, President Roosevelt appointed a Conference on Postwar Readjustment of Civilian and Military Personnel composed only of representatives of governmental agencies. In June,

2. *Ibid.*, August 3, 1944, p. 10.

3. New York, 1942.

1943, the Conference submitted a report, *Demobilization and Reconversion*, to the President, urging the development of a program of vocational training, the planning of special courses by colleges and universities, the appropriation of funds by the Federal Government to assure adequate educational services, and the cooperation of community, state, and national agencies to provide suitable opportunities for the education of veterans. In November, 1942, the President appointed another committee of educators, under the auspices of the War and Navy Departments, "for the taking of steps to enable young men, whose education has been interrupted, to resume their schooling and afford equal opportunity for the training and education of other young men of ability after their service in the armed forces comes to an end." In a report issued on October 27, 1943, this committee recommended a plan which became the basis of legislative provisions for the education of returning veterans.

At the same time attention began to be directed to the problem of providing for the adequate rehabilitation of disabled veterans and of workers injured in war industry. Separate legislation was enacted for the three groups—veterans, disabled veterans, and workers disabled in war industry.

On March 24, 1943, President Roosevelt signed the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (Public Law 16, later amended by Public Law 268). On June 22, 1944, he signed the Servicemen's Readjustment Act (Public Law 346, later amended by Public Law 268), which came to be known as the G.I. Bill of Rights. Both laws were to be administered by the Veterans Administration.

The G.I. Bill provided that all veterans, discharged under conditions other than dishonorable, who had served 90 days on active duty on or after September 16, 1940, would be eligible under its provisions to "receive such course of education or training, full-time or the equivalent thereof in part-time training, as he may elect, and at any approved educational or training institution in which he chooses to enroll." The studies that might be elected ranged from elementary subjects to postdoctoral work, and they could be pursued for one year plus the time in active service between September 16, 1940, and the termination of the war but not to exceed four years. An institution must accept or retain a veteran entitled to the benefits of the bill "as a student or trainee

in any field or branch of knowledge which such institution finds him qualified to undertake or pursue, while the conduct or progress of the veteran must be satisfactory according to the regularly prescribed standards and practices of the institution."

Under the provision of both Public Law 346 and Public Law 16 courses could be pursued in any school or college or, if on-the-job training was selected, in industry or on farms. Institutions selected by veterans under Public Law 346 had to be approved by state agencies appointed or designated by the governor; disabled veterans under Public Law 16 could select the institution in which they wished to study or be trained only after counseling and on approval by the Veterans Administration.

The payments to veterans, originally fixed at \$50 a month for those without dependents and \$75 a month for those with one or more dependents, were raised to \$65 and \$90 respectively by the amending act (Public Law 268) of December 28, 1945. Disabled veterans were entitled to pension, retirement, or military compensation plus subsistence allowances of \$105 a month if without dependents, and \$115 a month if one dependent, plus \$10 for one child, \$7 for each additional child, and \$15 for a dependent parent. At this time there was no limitation placed on the amount the veteran could earn and still receive his subsistence allowance from the government. By 1947, however, the total amount a veteran—married or single—could earn above his government allowance without having it cut was \$110 a month. This allowed the single veteran a total income of \$175 a month and the married veteran a total income of \$200 a month—if both were receiving full government subsistence. The disabled veteran was not limited as to the amount he could earn while in school, but if he was working he was limited to a journeyman's wage in excess of his government subsistence.

Institutions approved for the education or training of veterans were to be paid established fees or cost of teaching and instructional supplies up to a maximum of \$500 for an ordinary school year for each veteran student.

Measures began to be taken by a variety of agencies (local, state, and federal) to bring the benefits of the G.I. Bill to the attention of members of the armed forces and to establish centers to counsel returning veterans. *A Guide to Colleges, Universities*

and Professional Schools in the United States was prepared to assist education officers and others in answering the questions of military personnel. Assistance and information were given by the Army Separation Counseling Service and the Navy Civilian Readjustment Program to help the veteran in his return to civilian life. The Veterans Administration prepared and distributed a *Manual of Advisement and Guidance*, and conducted regional institutes to interpret counseling procedures.⁴

The nationwide interest in the provision of some recognition to a generation to which the nation owed so much is indicated by Dr. Francis J. Brown in the concluding paragraph of his book:

The people, through the Congress, have extended the opportunity of education and training to each of the 15 million who have served, or are still serving, in the armed forces. They have indicated that the provision of such education and training is a responsibility to be shared by the local community, by the state, by the federal government, and by the veteran himself. Through their cooperation, the hopes and aspirations running deep in the hearts of the American people can, and will be realized.⁵

ACCREDITATION AND PROSPECTIVE ENROLLMENTS

Two issues immediately had to be taken into consideration after the enactment of the G.I. Bill. The first was the number of returning soldiers who would be likely to avail themselves of its benefits; the second was the question of accreditation for military experience and education while in service and for educational level reached before entry into the service.

A study of army personnel before plans for their postwar education began to be made showed that only 7 per cent of enlisted men intended to continue with further education or training. After the G.I. Bill had been enacted, 8 per cent of the army as a whole (officers and enlisted men) had definite plans and 4 per cent had tentative plans for full-time education, while 19 per cent were planning to pursue part-time education; 69 per cent had no plans for further education. Of the enlisted men who

4. A detailed account of the whole subject and many of the problems involved is presented by Francis J. Brown, *Educational Opportunities for Veterans*, Washington, D. C., 1946.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 99.

planned to attend school full-time, 76 per cent expected to go to a college or university, 6 per cent to an academic high school, 12 per cent to a trade or vocational school, and 5 per cent to a business school, while the rest had other plans or were unclassified.⁶

When the problem was approached from the point of view of an estimate of the numbers eligible for admission to the colleges and universities, the picture statistically was different. It was found that nearly four World War II veterans were eligible to undertake graduate study as compared with one veteran of World War I. While only 7 per cent of the men who fought in World War I were ready to enter college, the figure for World War II veterans was 36 per cent. With the enactment of the G.I. Bill of Rights it was expected that 46 per cent of the army personnel, whose formal education was between the fifth grade and the completion of two years of high school, might avail themselves of the opportunity to continue full-time or part-time education in vocational, technical, and trade schools, whereas little was done to encourage further education and retraining by the 65 per cent of the soldiers of World War I who had received the same amount of formal education. On the basis of estimates, published in November, 1944, it was expected that 12 per cent of the eleven million men and women in the armed forces might return for full-time education in schools and colleges.⁷

The educational level of army enlisted men in World War II was considerably higher than in World War I. An analysis of the educational level of 7,144,401 men showed the following distribution of the men who were 25 years of age or under (3,789,545 or 53 per cent):

Grade schools 1 to 8 years	899,127	23 7 per cent
1, 2, 3 years of high school	1,233,304	32 5
4 years high school and 1, 2, 3 years of college	1,551,800	41 0
4 years college and up.	105,314	2 8

The distribution of a national sample of male army officers and enlisted men was as follows:

6. *Ibid.*, pp. 43 f.

7. *Education for Victory*, November 3, 1944, pp. 13 f.

	Officers	Per cent	Men	Per cent
Grade schools 1 to 8 years*	10,794	1 5	2,045,187	28 6
1, 2, 3 years high school	87,159	12 0	2,328,537	32 6
4 years high school	162,116	22 2	1,973,321	27 6
1, 2, 3 years college	191,019	26 2	585,758	8 2
4 years college	158,160	21 7	146,263	2 1
Graduate work	119,945	16 4	65,335	9
Total .	729,193		7,144,401	

*Includes some illiterates.

An interesting and important result of the study of the educational level of army personnel was the light thrown upon the distribution of education in the general population twenty to thirty-nine years of age inclusive and by states. Of the general population 42.7 per cent

had advanced no further than the eighth grade, as compared with 28.6 per cent of the enlisted men. The other extreme of the distribution documents what the initiated would expect, namely, that the general population has a larger population of persons with college and professional training than prevailed among army enlisted men, but a very much smaller proportion among army officers.⁸

Statistics on the rejection rates per hundred Selective Service registrants because of educational deficiency and on the relative effort made by the states in supporting education revealed, first, that "the states having a high rejection rate for educational deficiency are also the ones that have large percentages of army personnel whose education is at or below eighth grade," and, secondly, that "in states where the educational attainment of soldiers is high, the amount expended on education per child is high. In states where the per capita expenditure for education is low, soldiers make a poor educational showing even where the states make a greater than average effort to provide an adequate program of education."⁹

It is too early at this stage to determine whether the actual enrollments of G.I.'s in colleges and universities bear out the predic-

8. E. V. Hollis, *Data for State-wide Planning of Veterans' Education*, U. S. Office of Education, Bulletin, 1945, No. 4, p. 65. The tables above are based on this source, pp. 50 f. and 54.

9. *Ibid.*, pp. 65 f.

tions of the estimates. The situation may have been affected by employment opportunities and the fact that the benefits of the G.I. Bill may be taken up within four years after separation from service. According to the statistics of enrollments in 668 colleges and universities in the fall of 1946, of the 1,331,138 students enrolled 714,477, or 53.7 per cent, were veterans; of 350,000 students estimated for 650 junior colleges about 150,000 were veterans.¹⁰

According to a report issued by the Veterans Administration the total number of veterans enrolled under the educational provisions of the G.I. Bill of Rights was 1,572,049 on December 31, 1946; this figure would include all enrolled in high schools, colleges, and universities. The number of disabled veterans taking vocational courses under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act (Public Law 16) was 106,822. The number taking on-the-job training was 629,157. Checks for subsistence allowances certified for payment during 1946 totaled about \$1,100,000,000, and, during December, \$170,000,000.¹¹

In a report issued in February, 1947, the Veterans Administration announced that 40 per cent of the veterans had applied for some form of education or training—5,182,523 under Public Law 346 and 659,767 under Public Law 16. The total number actually enrolled for training and education was 2,495,403 (2,284,861 under Public Law 346 and 210,542 under Public Law 16). Of these 71 per cent were enrolled in schools and colleges and 29 per cent were receiving on-the-job training.¹²

The problem of school and college credits to be granted for military service, and educational experience in the armed forces began to receive attention early in 1942. It was recognized that the practice, following World War I, of granting varying amounts of credit to returning students who had served a minimum period of time in the armed forces was unsatisfactory as well as unsound. Further, in the years between the two wars more discriminating methods had been made available through

10. Raymond Walters, "Statistics of Attendance in American Universities and Colleges, 1946," *School and Society*, December 31, 1946, pp. 428 ff.

11. *School and Society*, March 15, 1947, p. 190.

12. *School and Society*, April 26, 1947, p. 304.

the development of test materials and procedures. A new factor had also to be taken into consideration due to the provision of educational programs within the army and navy, which included beside the basic training, Officer Candidate Schools, specialized technical schools, and the opportunities for off-duty education under the United States Armed Forces Institute and the colleges and universities under contact with the Institute.

In 1942 the American Council on Education appointed a special Committee on Accrediting Procedures to investigate the whole question. Following a meeting of the Committee on April 6, 1942, the following recommendations were transmitted to the Subcommittee on Education of the Joint Army-Navy Committee on Welfare and Education, that

Success in the army correspondence courses be appraised in terms of skills, attitudes, and knowledge achieved by the students; that the Army Institute provide opportunity for soldiers, not registered in courses, but who have had comparable training experience, to take the appraisal tests and to receive proficiency ratings if they achieve a satisfactory standing in such tests; and that carefully constructed appraisal tests be used to determine the educational significance of skills acquired through varied types of war experience.¹³

Following approval of these recommendations by Brigadier General Frederick H. Osborn, the subcommittee was authorized to set up a group to develop the necessary tests, the cost to be borne by the Army. The University of Chicago was selected as the contracting agent and Dr. Ralph W. Tyler was appointed director of the Staff for the Development of Testing Materials. Three types of tests were prepared, as follows: "qualifying tests to determine the ability of the individual to take the course he has selected; achievement tests to cover the courses offered in the army program; and examinations to determine the educational competence of the individual in terms of high school or college credit." The tests were made available by USAFI to all enlisted men in the Army and to officers and enlisted personnel in the Navy and Coast Guard, whether courses had or had not been taken in the Institute and regardless of past educational experi-

13. American Council on Education, *Higher Education and National Defense*, Bulletin No. 36, October 23, 1942.

ence. The Institute, however, left the responsibility of evaluating the results of the tests in terms of credits to the high schools and colleges to which the scores might be sent by the applicants.

The following resolutions on the question of credits were adopted at a conference of representatives of regional accrediting associations and special committees called by the American Council on Education and held on May 28, 1942:

Whereas, the educational program conducted by and through the Army Institute meets the specific needs of men in the armed forces; and

Whereas, the program is basically sound as an educational experience and is related to the levels of achievement of the individual; and

Whereas, the procedure in the formulation and administration of both instructional and testing materials is in keeping with sound educational practice;

Therefore it is recommended that:

1. Schools and colleges recognize in anticipation of the soldiers' readmission to school or college for appropriate credit and proper placement of the student the appraisal of the level of competence of the individual based on Army Institute examinations of the individual's educational experience acquired while within the armed forces either through Institute courses or in such training as officer candidate schools, specialist training in aerodynamics, or the orientation program;

2. Schools and colleges recognize for appropriate credit and proper placement of the individual student, the record of correspondence courses completed through the Institute and given by participating schools and colleges;

3. Schools and colleges recognize for appropriate credit and proper placement of the individual student, courses completed in foreign universities and schools either on the basis of the usual channels of transfer of credit or on the basis of the level of competence as appraised by Institute examinations of the level of competence.

It was also resolved to send copies of the statement to regional associations to be referred to their member organizations and institutions for appropriate action, and to state departments of

education for such modifications of existing laws as would facilitate carrying out the recommendations by schools and colleges within the state jurisdiction.¹⁴

In February, 1943, the American Council on Education published a pamphlet on *Sound Educational Credit for Military Experience: A Recommended Program*, prepared in cooperation with USAFI, the Education Branch of the Special Service Division, and regional accrediting associations. This pamphlet was followed later by another on *Sound Educational Credit for Military Experience: Answers and Questions*, prepared by Francis J. Brown of the Council's staff. In a *Guide to the Evaluation of Educational Experience in the Armed Forces*, published in 1944 for the use of high schools and colleges, the specific training courses of the Army and Navy were described and recommendations were made regarding the amount of credit to be assigned.¹⁵

The general recommendations which were reached were as follows: (1) Credit given for military training should not exceed half a semester of college credit or one semester of high school credit. (2) Students considered for admission to college should be classified on the basis of competence demonstrated in the General Educational Development Examination, given either by USAFI or the higher education institution concerned. (3) Credit for work done in the various educational programs provided while in service should be given on the basis of tests and competence profiles from USAFI. These recommendations were generally adopted for the admission of veterans to colleges and universities, the determination of the actual amount of credit to be assigned being left to each institutions.

Similar recommendations for the return of veterans who wished to complete their secondary education were made, *mutatis mutandis*, by a Committee on Secondary-School Credit for Educational Experience in Military Service of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals. Following its meeting in Cleveland, Ohio, on May 21-23, 1943, the Committee issued a

14. *Ibid.*

15. See American Council on Education, *Higher Education and National Defense*, Bulletins No. 49, March 8, 1943; No. 59, October 10, 1943; No. 69, July 26, 1944; and No. 74, November 30, 1944.

pamphlet on *Secondary-School Credit for Educational Experience in Military Service: A Recommended Program*. The Committee recommended that a request for academic or school credit must be initiated by the serviceman desiring credit. As in the case of candidates for entrance to colleges and universities, USAFI served as a central clearing house, furnishing application forms to be filled out by applicants and their commanding officers and assembling all other necessary materials for the civilian school or institution, including:

1. Identification information; that is, the name, branch of Service, and serial or file number of the individual requesting credit.
2. Information concerning the last civilian school attended and grade completed.
3. A report of the Service schools attended, with brief description of all courses taken, length of course, and grades.
4. A description of present Service job.
5. Report on correspondence subjects or courses with brief description of subject content and final grade.
6. Report on independent or class study, with brief description of subject, length of course, and final grade.
7. Report on special tests, with brief description of tests and interpretation of test score.¹⁶

On the basis of this information the schools concerned and not USAFI were required to assume responsibility for the evaluation of credits. After taking action, the school authorities were expected to report to USAFI, which in turn transmitted notification of the action to the applicants. The Committee warned the school authorities that the evaluation of education in military service required special consideration:

The War and the Navy Departments realize that the educational experiences provided by military service differ in many respects from that provided in the usual curriculums of secondary schools and colleges. The kind of education gained in Service may often, however, make no less valuable a contribution to the individual student's development than the training he would have received

16. National Association of Secondary-School Principals, *Secondary-School Credit for Educational Experience in Military Service: A Recommended Program*, Washington, D. C., 1943, p. 25.

from many more orthodox courses in civilian institutions. It is hoped that this consideration will be given due weight in evaluating training and experience in the services which cannot completely parallel the usual civilian instruction.

The quality of instruction given in the Services is of a high caliber and can be compared very favorably with instruction in civilian schools. In addition, it should be realized that, with many thousands of Service personnel, off-duty programs of education are being undertaken in addition to their full-time Service jobs which, in most cases, are more demanding and require longer hours than jobs in civilian life. Often the conditions under which such study must be done are far from favorable and the surmounting of obstacles is a tribute to the energy and initiative of these young people in advancing themselves and in carrying forward the lessons of self-improvement which they learned so well in our American school system. Educators have a definite role to play in maintaining the morale of these men and women and in promoting their interests in school education, which is, after all, the core and heart of democracy.¹⁷

The important question whether the veterans would adjust themselves readily to the new routine of study and training began to be answered early in 1946. Despite all the difficulties in securing admission to educational institutions, the overcrowding in all colleges and universities, and the problem of housing, the students, many of whom were married and had children, the reports from all parts of the country indicated that the veterans were making better grades than nonveterans, that there were no difficulties in their readjustment, and that there was a marked seriousness in the way in which they settled down to their studies. This was attributed to the maturity and broader experience of the veterans as well as to a clearer conception of aims and objectives.

The full story of the social and educational effects of the provisions for veterans cannot be written for several years; when it is written it will present a striking chapter in the history of American education. One important part of the story will be the report of a comprehensive study initiated in March, 1947, by the

17. *Ibid.*, p. 26.

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and the Carnegie Corporation of New York to answer the much discussed question whether veterans made better students than non-veterans.¹⁸

POST-HOSTILITIES EDUCATION PROGRAM

Profiting by the experience at the end of World War I, when an educational program had not been prepared and organized until after hostilities had ceased, the army authorities, through the Special Services Division of the War Department, later called the Information and Education Division of the Army, turned their attention to the preparation of a post-hostilities education program which was completed long before V-E day for the European and Mediterranean theaters. The program included the provision of a wide range of educational facilities from literacy training to higher education and educational and vocational guidance services. Textbooks and instructional materials were prepared and began to be shipped to Europe even before hostilities ended.

When the program was put into operation on August 1, 1945, the following opportunities for the education of army personnel—officers and enlisted men—were made available:

1. Command or unit schools were established at battalion and other levels under the charge of trained Information-Education officers and an Institution Officer for each unit. The subjects of instruction included literacy training for soldiers who had not completed the fourth or fifth grade of the elementary school, and high school courses with on-the-job training where equipment was available. In September, 1945, there were about 500 unit schools attended by more than 100,000 officers and enlisted personnel.
2. The second level of education was provided in centralized technical schools, organized at the regimental, division, or corps level and planned to offer refresher courses and retraining in skills to those who had already had trade training and experience before entering the army.

18. See *School and Society*, March 29, 1947, p. 221 f.

3. The highest level of education was offered in Army University Centers. The first of these—in Florence—was opened in July, 1945. Three others, opened in August, 1945, were located at Biarritz in the French Riviera, at Shrivenham in a former British military school near Oxford, and at Warton, near Manchester, in a United States Air Forces service depot.¹⁹ The last of these was organized as a technological institute. Except in Florence, where the number of students was considerably smaller, the other university centers were planned for 4,000 students, selected on a percentage basis from the various army units on certification of their commanders that they had completed high school. The majority of the students, including officers and enlisted men, WAAC and army nurses, were high school graduates; others had completed several years of college, and a still smaller number were college graduates. The courses were planned for eight week terms, each class meeting for five fifty minute periods a week. Each student was permitted to take three courses and to remain for one term only; a few students of superior ability were allowed to continue for a second term.

The faculties consisted of instructors who had demonstrated ability as teachers in military training courses or had had experience as teachers and administrators in civilian life, and civilian educators carefully selected from colleges and universities by the Information and Education Division in Washington. Distinctions of rank were not observed as between officers and enlisted men, whether as instructors or as students. In general the aim in each center was to follow the standards and procedures of institutions of higher education in the United States. In general the courses were planned for freshmen and sophomores. The following table giving the number of courses, classes, faculty members, and students at Biarritz in the first term, August 20 to October 12, 1945, is presented as an illustration of the organization of a university center:²⁰

19. An Army University Center was also opened in Honolulu in December, 1945, and continued until March, 1946, with four week terms. The total enrollment for the entire period of operation was about 3,000. The faculty was entirely military.

20. John Dale Russell, "The Army University Centers in the European Theater." *The Educational Record*, January, 1946, p. 9.

Section	Courses	Classes	Instructors*	Student Course Registration**
Agriculture	23	35	15	953
Commerce	38	120	55	3,178
Education	16	25	14	413
Engineering	22	26	18	503
Fine Arts.	43	67	35	1,330
Journalism	11	20	11	538
Liberal Arts	85	171	73	3,169
Science	28	93	51	1,802
Total	266	559	272	11,886

*As of September 24, 1945.

**As of August 25, 1945

The comparable statistics for the second session at Shrivenham are given in the following table, except that the number of instructors was not available:²¹

Academic Sections	Number of Courses	Number of Sections	Class Enrollments	Increase or Decrease over 1st Session
Agriculture.	25	34	788	+25
Commerce	48	129	3,084	+429
Education..	16	21	220	-123
Engineering	22	27	340	-44
Fine Arts..	32	44	826	0
Journalism	9	16	290	-69
Liberal Arts	108	192	3,576	+765
Science	33	85	1,383	+49
Total	293	548	10,507	+1,032

Although the experiment was shortlived—the Biarritz center ceased to operate after two terms and that at Shrivenham after three terms—its success proved its value not only in providing opportunities for education but in serving as a bridge between army and civilian life. The possible contribution to future programs of education in the Army is described as follows by Dr. John Dale Russell, who served as dean and academic adviser at the Army University Center at Biarritz:

The ventures into fields of higher education by the American Army in the European theater may have considerable influence on

21. *A History of Shrivenham American University*, p. 60. Swindon, England, 1946. The order of the academic sections was rearranged to facilitate comparison with the table on the Biarritz center.

the entire operation of military service during peacetime. The very obvious success of the two University Study Centers and the great demand for their services indicate that the Army may become an important agency for higher education. The attractiveness of service in the peacetime Army may readily be increased for men of ability by affording appropriate opportunities for continued education in the usual academic branches. The evidence from the experience at Biarritz and Shrivenham is that the Army can operate such a program on an entirely satisfactory basis.²²

The following summary from *A History of Shrivenham American University* (p. 116) is cited as having more general application than the preceding quotation:

In the vast majority of cases, the problems which the returning veteran poses for educators are no different in kind from those posed by other men who return to college after several maturing years in a non-academic world. Most of the recommendations which grow out of this report are generally regarded as desirable for all students, and the return of tens of thousands of veterans at once merely intensifies the need for their careful reconsideration.

The composite military experience has definitely accelerated maturation, particularly in the case of the younger soldier. The veteran is highly motivated. He is impatient of wasted effort, useless activity, and lost time. He is realistic and functional in his approach to education. His return to the American campus will not revolutionize higher education, but the impact of that return will be felt quickly and forcefully. It appears from the Shrivenham experience that the net result will be wholesome, stimulating, and challenging.

4. Arrangements were made for a limited number of military personnel to enter universities in the United Kingdom, Belgium, France, and Italy for periods of three months or to secure training in private industrial firms.

In addition to these provisions for organized educational programs, the opportunities for education by correspondence courses through USAFI were used by an increased number of the personnel, and furlough and field trips to places of cultural and historical interest were arranged as part of the education services.

Comparable services were provided for men in the navy under the Navy Program of Education Services and Civil Readjustment

22. *Ibid.*, p. 23.

prepared some time before the cessation of hostilities by the Bureau of Naval Personnel of the Navy Department. The problems of the Navy differed from those of the Army, since even when hostilities came to an end regular duties of maintenance still had to be continued. There was the further difference in the size of the personnel on each vessel and at each station. Education Service Officers who were trained and experienced teachers or organizers were stationed with few exceptions at all naval activities of over two thousand men; in small activities the education work was placed in charge of officers or enlisted men.

The education services began to be provided some three years before the end of the war. In April, 1944, a Civil Readjustment Program was added to Education Services in order to disseminate information to the personnel, prior to discharge, as to their rights and benefits and to prepare them for readjustment to civil life. At the same time a shift of emphasis was made in the education program to meet new problems and interests of the personnel. Counseling and guidance were provided for educational and vocational training; courses were offered in academic subjects ranging from literacy training to college subjects; preparation for a variety of jobs was given; and information was disseminated on current political and economic developments. As in the army, so in the navy arrangements for testing and accreditation through USAFI were made.

The account presented in this chapter lays no claim to being complete. Nor is it possible to evaluate the nonmilitary educational activities organized for the personnel in the army and navy; the effects may be seen perhaps in years to come. Whether other types of educational activities that might have laid the foundation for peacetime programs of adult education could have been organized, if there had not been so much concern about credits, it is difficult to say. What was done and what was achieved followed the normal pattern of American education which is expressed in the characterization of the Shrivenham soldier-student, that "he is realistic and functional in his approach to education." Too often, however, this means for the student a record of what he "has had" and a preparation for a living rather than for life. The desirability of programs of education for intelligent citizenship without concern for formal accreditation was recognized. In

September, 1943, the Special Service Division Headquarters, European Theater of Operations, began the publication of a series of army talks, described as "unique in the history of the U. S. Army." The series is introduced with the statement that

For the first time an American army is in the most literal sense "going to school," while fighting a war. It is going to school to become a more efficient army to return its soldiers more competent citizens.

In this great program *Army Talks* have a basic role. They are the springboard into that free discussion around which not only an army's educational program revolves, but upon which ultimately the democratic form of government is based. They are in themselves a demonstration as well as an expression of democracy at work.

The *Army Talks* series was "undertaken to implement one of the greatest experiments in adult education." There is at present no evidence available to indicate how far-reaching or how successful this experiment was. There can be no doubt, however, about the soundness of the idea and aim underlying the provision of such education as an experiment in adult education.

■

INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL RELATIONS

THE GROWING RECOGNITION, even before the nation entered World War II, of the important part that the United States would play in international affairs, stimulated a widespread interest in international cultural relations. Whatever political opinion may have been, the United States has not been intellectually isolationist. The story of the influence of foreign educational theories and practices upon the development of American education can be found in every history of American education. American scholars have participated increasingly in international congresses and organizations. It was not until after World War II, however, that American schools and colleges began to devote greater attention than ever before to the study of international relations in general.¹ It was also after World War I that the flow of foreign students to American institutions of higher education and of American students to foreign universities became marked. This movement for the exchange of students, teachers, and professors was promoted by voluntary agencies and the educational foundations.² The participation of governmental agencies in international cultural affairs and in student and other exchanges did not begin until shortly before the outbreak of World War II.³

The development of the Good Neighbor Policy in the thirties stimulated interest throughout the country in the study of Spanish (and later Portuguese), and of Latin American history, institutions, and culture. Formal participation by an agency of government in the promotion and conduct of international cultural

1. See Edith E. Ware, *The Study of International Relations in the United States*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1934 and 1938.

2. See I. L. Kandel, *United States Activities in International Relations*, Chaps. II and III, Washington, D. C., 1945.

3. Although the remission of the Boxer Indemnity fund was voted by Congress, the administration of the fund established for educational purposes was assigned to a nonofficial body, the China Foundation for the Promotion of Education and Culture (1924).

relations began in 1938, when the Division of Cultural Relations was created in the Department of State. Because of the imminence and then the outbreak of World War II the activities of this Division were limited to the Western Hemisphere. Before that date the United States Government had been a member of the Pan American Union and was officially represented in Western Hemisphere congresses and in the American Scientific Congress. In 1936 the United States had signed the Convention for the Promotion of Inter-American Relations, which resulted from the meeting of ministers of the American Republics in Buenos Aires in 1936.

When the Division of Cultural Relations was created in the Department of State, it was with the clear understanding that it was not to be employed to implement the foreign policy of the United States. The programs, as defined in a memorandum of June 1, 1939, included the exchange of professors, teachers, and students, cooperation in the fields of music, art, literature and other intellectual and cultural affairs, the distribution of libraries of representative works of the United States in the original and in translations, participation in international expositions and radio broadcasts, and "generally the dissemination abroad of the representative intellectual and cultural works of the United States and the improvement of our cultural relations with other countries." The general principle governing the conduct of international cultural relations by government was stated as follows:

The field of activities thus laid out for the Division is that of genuine cultural relations. It is not a "propaganda" agency, in the popular sense of the term which carries with it implications of penetration, imposition, and unilateralism. If its endeavors are to be directed toward the development of a truer and more realistic understanding between the peoples of the United States and those of other nations, it is believed that such a goal can most surely be attained by a program which is definitely educational in character, and which emphasizes the essential reciprocity in cultural relations. A primary function of this Division will be to serve as a clearing house and coordinating agency for the activities of private agencies in the field of cultural relations. . . .

We are operating in an area in which ill-guided action, no matter how worthy the intention, may cause lasting wounds. It is essential

that the Department have every facility for refined sensitivity to the situation with which it is dealing and the reactions of those whose confidence and cooperation it is seeking.

The record of the Division of Cultural Relations, whose title has been changed several times—first to Division of Science, Education, and Art, then to Division of Cultural Cooperation, and finally to Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs—is evidence that this principle has been faithfully observed. The task of maintaining a distinction between “information and education” and “propaganda” is a delicate one. Every effort appears to have been made to maintain that distinction.

Although limited to cultural relations with the Latin American Republics, the exigencies of the war produced situations outside of this area which had to be met by the Department of State. Some 1,500 Chinese students found themselves stranded in this country and unable to secure funds from home. A fund was created and administered by the Department of State to assist Chinese students recommended for financial aid by the Governments of the United States and China. In 1943 a system of exchange professors was established with China and technical experts were sent to that country in fields designated by the Chinese Government.

Grants were also made by the United States Government to the Near East College Association of New York to assist six nonsecretarian colleges established by American citizens, which found themselves in financial difficulties owing to the war, for special projects in education, health, engineering, and agriculture; and to the Booker Washington Agricultural and Industrial Institute in Liberia to train motor mechanics, organize a demonstration health clinic, to conduct extension work on better housing, and to experiment with better food processing. Funds were also provided to aid North American sponsored schools in Latin American countries and the Inter-American Schools Service of the American Council on Education was established to administer them. This was the first time that the need for assisting North American schools abroad was recognized officially on the grounds that such schools not only served the children of American citizens residing in foreign countries but were also

bridgeheads of cultural understanding and centers for the demonstration of American educational theories and practices.

To meet the emergency conditions which arose out of the war and to strengthen solidarity among the nations of the Western Hemisphere, the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, later called the Office of Inter-American Affairs, was established by executive order of June 30, 1940. The functions assigned to the Office were: To coordinate the cultural and commercial relations of the American nations in so far as they affected hemisphere defense; with the cooperation of the Department of State to further national defense and strengthen the bonds between these nations by the effective use of governmental and private facilities in such fields as the arts and sciences, education and travel, the radio, the press, and the cinema; to further the commercial well-being of the Western Hemisphere; and in other ways to advance the cultural and commercial objectives of the government's program of hemisphere solidarity. On the educational and cultural side the Office promoted the exchange of educators; the improvement of textbooks, visual aids and other materials of instruction; the improvement of methods of teaching English in Latin American countries; the advancement of standards of living through the development of mass literacy, health, and vocational proficiency; and the provision of assistance in the reorganization of elementary and secondary education, and the preparation of teachers. These programs were initiated at the request of the governments concerned and were carried out jointly under contracts between the appropriate officials in the Latin American countries and the Office, acting through the Inter-American Education Foundation, Inc., established on September 25, 1943, and with approval of a joint committee representing the Foundation, the Division of Cultural Cooperation, as it was then called, of the Department of State, and the American Council of Learned Societies. The cost of each project is borne by the Foundation and the country concerned. This plan of cooperative effort in which selected representatives of the United States and of foreign countries work side by side with and learn from each other is an innovation in international educational relations. The traditional practice, common in the Latin American countries, of inviting

foreign missions to undertake the reorganization and even the administration of aspects of education has been abandoned in favor of a plan under which their own prospective leaders are prepared to assume responsibility for the progress of education. Advice and assistance have been requested on the development of vocational, agricultural, and rural education (Bolivia, Brazil, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Haiti, Honduras, and Peru), and on the reorganization of secondary education (Chile), and specialists on the teaching of English have been invited.⁴ Particularly active in providing instruction in English have been the cultural institutes, whose creation in the Latin American countries has been encouraged by the cultural division of the Department of State. In 1941 the Department of State adopted a plan of appointing cultural relations officers or cultural attachés, assigned to American embassies, legations, and consulates, to supervise cultural relations activities in the countries of their assignment.

In the reorganization, which resulted in the change of the name of the Division to that of Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs, the scope of the cultural relations activities was gradually expanded. This was the intent of the Bloom Bill (H.R. 4982) which was introduced in the House of Representatives on December 13, 1945 and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs. The purpose of the Bill was

To enable the Department of State more effectively to carry out its responsibilities in the foreign field by means of (a) public dissemination of information abroad about the United States, its people and its policies, and (b) promotion of the interchange of persons, knowledge, and skills between the people of the United States and the peoples of other countries.

Although the Bill was not enacted by the Seventy-ninth Congress, the activities of the Office include virtually all of the projects which the Bill was intended to undertake—such as the

4. In 1943 the American Council on Education, with the aid of a grant from the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, published in Spanish and Portuguese a series of seven pamphlets, edited by I. L. Kandel, on *Education in the United States*. An eighth pamphlet on Catholic Educational Institutions was added in 1945. The series of seven pamphlets was also translated locally into Italian and Arabic.

dissemination abroad of information about the United States through publications and radio broadcasts; the interchange of students, professors, and outstanding persons in the fields of press, radio, motion pictures, education, science, the arts, agriculture, public health, and other leaders of national affairs; technical projects undertaken and jointly financed by the United States and another government; preparation and dissemination of information abroad; preparation, distribution, and interchange of educational materials; development and demonstration of better methods of teaching English abroad; assistance to American sponsored schools, libraries, and community centers abroad; and assignment of scientific, technical, and other experts for temporary service to or in cooperation with the government of another country requesting such services.

Under an amendment adopted by the Seventy-ninth Congress (Public Law 584) to the Surplus Property Act of 1944, generally known as the Fulbright Bill, the functions of the Office in the exchange of students will be enlarged. The section of the law dealing with the sale of surplus lend-lease property authorized the Secretary of State to enter into agreements with any foreign government "for the use of currencies, or credits for currencies, of such government acquired as a result of such property disposals, for the purpose of providing by the formation of foundations or otherwise" for educational purposes. These will include financing studies, research, instruction, and other educational activities and the exchange of students, including payment for transportation, tuition, maintenance, and other expenses incident to scholastic activities or furnishing transportation for citizens of the foreign country concerned who desire to attend American schools and institutions of higher learning. The flow of foreign students to this country began soon after the end of the war, some at their own expense, and others sent by their governments. When the provisions of the Fulbright Bill come into operation, a vast system of student exchanges will be created, which may prove to be one of the most important contributions to the promotion of international understanding and cooperation that has yet been developed.

Another governmental agency, which has been concerned in the program of international educational relations, is the

United States Office of Education. Through its division of Comparative Education, it provided information about education in other countries in its "News from Abroad," published in *Education for Victory*. It prepared basic studies on education in Latin American countries. It arranged internships for foreign students in American public schools and in the Office and assisted in finding teachers for Afghanistan and the Near East. The Office played an important part in promoting the study of foreign cultures (Chinese, Japanese, Thai, Indian, and Latin American) and prepared instructional materials for use in schools. Through the Division of Inter-American Education the activities of the Office were expanded with the aid of funds from the Department of State and the Office of Inter-American Affairs. These activities included the exchange of educational personnel, the selection of American teachers of Spanish as candidates for the Spanish Language Institute held in Mexico City, the preparation and exchange of teaching materials on Inter-American subjects, and the promotion of extracurricular activities to develop friendship among students of the American Republics.

Under a reorganization of the Office of Education, effected in 1945, the activities of the Divisions of Comparative Education and Inter-American Relations were enlarged and assigned to the new Division of International Educational Relations. The purpose of the expanded program was stated to be as follows:

The program of the Office in the field of international education is designed to aid in interpreting United States life and culture through educational agencies abroad and to help our people to understand and appreciate the life and civilization of other countries. The Office will assist United States teachers and students who wish to study in foreign countries and will provide foreign teachers and students who come to this country for educational training. The accelerated demands upon the Office of Education for information about educational systems, improved programs for language study, and reliable teaching materials, as well as for the exchange of educational personnel, are evidence of a widespread desire for the development of a true understanding of other peoples.

The Office proposes to meet these continuing and new calls for service in the field of international educational relations by providing a division which will have adequate staff and other necessary re-

sources to insure a service commensurate with the job to be done. This Division, enlarging upon the present Divisions of Comparative Education and Inter-American Educational Relations, will be comprised of four units, representing major geographical areas with which international educational relations may be anticipated.⁵

It is obvious that there is some overlapping in the conduct of international cultural relations between several governmental agencies. The functions of the Office of Inter-American Affairs were absorbed by the Department of State when the Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs was organized. It is also expected that when the projects now under way are completed the work of the Inter-American Education Foundation will also be transferred to this Office. The machinery for maintaining "the unity and cohesion necessary for a balanced program" was created in 1938 with the establishment of the Interdepartmental Committee on Cultural and Scientific Cooperation. The Committee was formed at the suggestion of President Roosevelt "to coordinate the activities of departments and agencies of the Government, under the leadership of the Department of State." Originally established as the Interdepartmental Committee on Cooperation with the American Republics, the present name was adopted on December 20, 1944, in anticipation of the broadening scope of the international cultural relations of the United States.⁶

The rapid expansion of governmental activities in the field of international cultural relations raises the serious and important issue of the part that voluntary organizations will play in this field in the future. Until recently it had been the established policy of the United States Government to leave such activities in the hands of voluntary organizations. It was for this reason that the cultural relations of the United States have never been open to the suspicion that they were employed, as they were by some other governments, to implement foreign policy. In all plans that have been discussed for the participation of governmental agencies in international cultural relations, the principle

5. *Annual Report of the United States Office of Education, 1944*, Washington, D. C., 1945, p. 99.

6. See *Interdepartmental Committee on Scientific and Cultural Cooperation*, Department of State, Publication 2323, Washington, D. C., 1945.

has always been emphasized that such agencies should serve as coordinating clearing houses and should secure the cooperation of voluntary agencies and "educational, intellectual, civic, and related institutions." This principle was carried out in the creation of a representative National Commission to cooperate with the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. Nor would any other principle be consistent with American policy in educational and cultural affairs. Voluntary organizations have played an important role in this field in the past; in the future they can and should be encouraged to play an even greater part.⁷

During the war years nothing was more striking and spectacular in the field of education than the widespread interest shown both by the public and by professional workers in the promotion of international educational and cultural relations and in the establishment of an international agency for education to promote understanding and cooperation among the peoples of the world as a guarantee of peace. Three aspects of the problem received major attention. The first was the reconstruction of education in the Axis countries and the reeducation of their peoples.⁸

The second was the problem of assistance to the liberated countries in the reorganization of their educational systems. Some assistance, limited wholly to material aid, was provided by the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration so far as was consistent with its terms of reference, and later through the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, which at its meeting in Paris in November, 1946, undertook to raise a fund to assist the liberated countries in their efforts to rebuild their educational system. In 1946 the Interna-

7. On the part played by such voluntary organizations in international cultural relations, see I. L. Kandel, *United States Activities in International Cultural Relations*, Chaps. II, III, and V; Edith E. Ware, *op. cit.*, *passim*; and Waldo G. Leland, *International Cultural Relations*, Denver, Colo., 1943.

8. This task was undertaken, as each of the Axis countries was defeated, by the Military Governments of the Army, assisted later by civilian educators. In 1946 Education Missions were sent to Japan and Germany to advise the Military Governments on the reconstruction of education. See the reports of the *United States Education Mission to Japan* and *United States Education Mission to Germany*. Washington, 1946.

tional Commission for International Education Reconstruction was organized in the United States, composed of representatives from about twenty-five of the leading organizations of the country. The Commission was established to raise funds to assist in the educational rehabilitation work abroad.

The third aspect of the problem, which attracted widespread interest and stimulated active efforts throughout the country, was the plan for the establishment of an international agency for education. American activities were strongly influenced by the deliberations of the Conference of Allied Ministers of Education, organized in London in 1942, and by the publication of a report on *Education and the United Nations*,⁹ which resulted from the deliberations of a Joint Commission of the Council for Education in World Citizenship and the London International Assembly. Until 1943 the United States was represented at the Conference of Allied Ministers of Education by an observer from the American Embassy in London. From 1944 on the Department of State cooperated actively with the Conference.

An active movement not only to arouse interest in the creation of an international agency for education but to enlist support for the other problems of educational reconstruction began in 1943. Among the national organizations which turned their attention to the educational aspects of world reconstruction alone or which included their consideration in discussions of plans for peace were the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, the United States Committee on Educational Reconstruction in cooperation with the Central European Planning Board, and the Institute on Educational Reconstruction of New York University, the Educational Policies Commission of National Educational Association, the Liaison Committee for International Education, the International Education Assembly, the Universities Committee on Postwar International Problems, the Committee on International Education of the American Council on Education, and the American Association for an International Office of Education.¹⁰

9. The report was reprinted by the American Council on Public Affairs, Washington, D. C., 1943.

10. Among the publications which appeared at this time the following may be cited: Educational Policies Commission, *Education and the Peo-*

As a result of national and regional conferences the draft constitution for a United Nations Organization for Educational and Cultural Reconstruction, which had been prepared in London in 1944, received widespread and favorable attention and support, and the various steps in the revision of the draft constitution were followed with interest. Since the Dumbarton Oaks Proposals did not specifically mention education, a strong delegation, representing the leading educational organizations, attended the San Francisco Conference to bring pressure to bear for the inclusion of education and culture in the United Nations Charter. In this the delegation met with success. No better indication of the attitude of the American public on the importance of creating an international agency for education can be cited than the unanimous adoption of the companion resolutions introduced in the House of Representatives by Congressman Karl E. Mundt of South Dakota and in the Senate by Senator Robert A. Taft of Ohio and Senator J. William Fulbright of Arkansas. House Resolution 215, Seventy-ninth Congress, first session, reads as follows:

WHEREAS the achievement of a peaceful and orderly life among the peoples of the world has become critical as a result of the war; and

WHEREAS the future peace and security of the American and of all other peoples rest upon the achievement of mutual understanding among the peoples of the world, the universal application of the principles of the Golden Rule, the application of reason and knowledge to the solution of domestic as well as international problems, and effective education at all levels; and

WHEREAS the Axis countries have pursued a deliberate policy

ple's Peace and Learning about Education and the Peace, Washington, D. C., 1943. Liaison Committee for International Education and the International Educational Assembly, *Education for International Security*, *Education for a Free Society*, *Education and the United Nations*, and *International Education through Cultural Exchange*. "International Frontiers in Education," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, September, 1944. I. L. Kandel, *Intellectual Cooperation, National and International*, New York, 1944. W. G. Carr, *Only by Understanding*, New York, 1945. Howard E. Wilson, "Education as an Implement of International Cooperation," *International Conciliation*, November, 1945, No. 415. Ruth McMurtry and Muna Lee, *The Cultural Approach*, Chapel Hill, 1947.

of destroying the technical, professional, and teaching personnel of the countries they have conquered, and have encouraged hatred and misunderstanding between nations, peoples, and cultural groups; and

WHEREAS these circumstances present a persisting problem which, if not solved, will result in the perpetuation of conditions of life most likely to cause peoples to resort to violence and war, and

WHEREAS it is essential to collaborate with other nations to promote educational advancement and at the same time to direct education toward the achievement of mutual understanding among the nations. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives of the United States urges the participation by the Government of the United States in the creation of an international educational and cultural organization by the nations of the world for the purpose of advising together and to consider problems of international educational and cultural relations throughout the world and more particularly to organize a permanent international agency to promote educational and cultural relations, the exchange of students, scholars, and other educational and cultural leaders and materials, and the encouragement within each country of friendly relations among nations, peoples, and cultural groups: *Provided, however*, That such agency shall not interfere with educational systems or programs within the several nations, or their administration.

In November, 1945, a conference of Allied Nations representatives was held in London to discuss the establishment of the auxiliary agency for education and culture, to be created under the United Nations Charter as an auxiliary agency of the Economic and Social Council, and to adopt a constitution. It was decided at this conference that the name of the agency should be the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). Following a Joint Resolution in both Houses of Congress authorizing the participation of the United States in UNESCO, President Truman signed the measure on July 30, 1946.¹¹

The Constitution of UNESCO, Article VII, provides that

Each member State shall make such arrangements as suit its par-

11. On the development of UNESCO see Department of State, *"The Defenses of Peace," Documents Relating to UNESCO. The United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization*, Parts I and II. Washington, D. C., 1946.

ticular conditions for the purpose of associating its principal bodies interested in educational scientific and cultural matters with the work of the Organization, preferably by the formation of a National Commission broadly representative of the Government and such bodies.

In carrying out this provision the Department of State, following the principle of close cooperation with voluntary agencies, secured the establishment, in September, 1946, of a National Commission for UNESCO, consisting of 100 members. Of these 40 were appointed by the Department of State; 50 by national organizations representing educational, scientific, and cultural organizations, the press, radio, moving pictures, religious and civic organizations; and 10 from other organizations chosen at the first meeting of the 90 appointees and delegates.¹²

As contrasted with the period between the two World Wars, when widespread interest and activity were shown in promoting the study of international relations and exchange of students, teachers, and professors,¹³ the participation of the United States in UNESCO and the establishment of governmental agencies to promote and conduct international cultural relations not only provide centers for the dissemination of information in this field but furnish that national leadership which was lacking in the earlier period. This does not mean that the role of voluntary organizations and of leaders in the educational systems will be less significant. It does mean, however, a clearer direction for their activities. The organization of the National Commission for UNESCO is a guarantee that the interests of international cultural cooperation will be channeled to all parts of the country through its members and their organizations. The dissemination of information about the programs and activities not only of UNESCO but also of the United Nations, properly directed, should have a profound influence at every level of education. To this influence should be added the new position of the United States as a center to which an increasing number of students

12. See United States—United Nations Information Series 14, *United States National Commission for UNESCO, Report of the First Meeting, September, 1946*, Washington, D. C., 1947.

13. See Edith E. Ware, *op. cit.*

from foreign countries will turn for educational and professional studies. In the long run, however, the development of the international mind and the guarantees of peace depend not so much on organization as on the education of public opinion, which in turn will support a program of the right kind of national education leading naturally to a conviction that the interests of the nation are intimately involved in and with the interests of all other nations of the world. Rarely in the history of education has a program for a new departure in education caught the public imagination so profoundly as did the campaign for the establishment of an international agency of education, which culminated in the creation of UNESCO. That campaign has already stimulated plans and discussions on the promotion of the study of international relations in the educational institutions of the country.

LESSONS OF THE WAR

THE EDUCATIONAL system of the United States was submitted during the war to a nation-wide survey which was far more searching than any deliberately organized survey could have been. World War I had affected higher education only; World War II revealed that no part of the educational system could remain unaffected. The situation was well described in the keynote statement by Paul V. McNutt when he wrote in the first issue of *Education for Victory*, March 3, 1942, that in the days of total war education had a new significance and that "You're in the Army now" was an expression of national necessity.

To this challenge the educational system, with little or no preparation, quickly responded. The speed with which the challenge was met illustrated the flexibility of the educational system and its adaptability to new demands. There was thus illustrated an important aspect of American education. Without waiting for a lead from a government agency, leadership was assumed by state and local administrations and by voluntary agencies—the National Education Association and its Educational Policies Commission for elementary and secondary education, and the American Council on Education for higher education, both of which had already begun to prepare the educational profession against the threat of war through their publications on national defense. In the field of higher education the American Council on Education had in fact prepared plans for the fullest use of colleges and universities in the event of war for some time before the official agencies—the War Department and the Navy Department—reached a decision on the question. Except in higher education the system of education was not seriously dislocated.

The war revealed the strong and the weak points of the educational system. Its general organization was not open to criticism. It responded readily to the new demands placed upon it. The

average level of education had been raised by at least two years since World War I. The graduates of colleges and universities proved to be excellent material for appointment or training for the commissioned ranks in the armed forces as well as in manifold civilian activities connected with the successful conduct of the war. Through federal grants provision for the training of personnel for the trade and technological needs of the war effort was quickly organized and successfully developed. And, finally, the teaching profession enlisted voluntarily in a great variety of activities demanded in the war effort.

The ideals and aims of the educational system were proved to be sound. The war revealed a number of weaknesses, however, which indicated that in practice these aims and ideals were not being achieved. The two most serious defects, the existence of which had been known before the war, were, first, the high percentage of men who had to be rejected by the Selective Service System on account of mental and physical deficiencies, and, second, the unsatisfactory status of the teaching profession. Despite the increasing expenditure on education illiteracy had not been eliminated, while the numbers rejected because of physical deficiencies pointed to the inadequate attention paid to health and physical development in the schools and by society in general. The large numbers of teachers who left the profession for better paid employment in war and other industries indicated that the American public was not willing to pay salaries commensurate with its professed faith in education and that conditions of service were not as satisfactory as they might be.

These defects were not always due to the inadequacy of local resources for the maintenance of satisfactory systems of education. In the main, however, they did confirm the fact, already known, that the amount and quality of education could not be improved except by the establishment of adequate minimum national standards by pooling the resources of the nation and by the provision of federal aid for education. If any further arguments to support those accumulated since the movement for federal aid began during World War I, they were provided by the objective data revealed during World War II. The fear that an increase of federal funds for education would lead to federal control was allayed during the war years. Federal appropriations

were increased for various educational activities during this period but there is no evidence that undue control followed. It became clearer than ever before, as a result of the conditions of education revealed during the war, that the ideal of equality of educational opportunity could only be achieved by the provision of federal funds to remove the inequalities due to accident of residence.

Other shortages were also revealed which reflected on the quality of education. It was found that the supply of personnel with suitable preparation in mathematics, science, and foreign languages was inadequate despite the large enrollment of students in schools, colleges, and universities. The lack of qualified personnel in foreign languages, both the usual and the unusual, was met by the adoption of new methods of instruction, whose value for normal times is still a matter of experimentation. The fact, however, is inescapable that more attention has been devoted to increasing the numbers of students in secondary and higher education than to maintaining adequate standards of quality of achievement.

The future of secondary and higher education received consideration during the war years, but the deliberations had already begun before the war. In secondary education the basic problem was how to meet the varied needs of American youth, the majority of whom were enrolled in high schools. Whether a satisfactory solution can be found in a common program, such as that proposed in the report of the Educational Policies Commission on *Education for All American Youth* without giving adequate attention to those who can profit by an academic attention, will probably continue to be debatable. At the level of college education proposals for reform, which had been begun before the war and on which an extensive literature was accumulated during the war, have already been adopted by many colleges. The chief point of attack was the system of electives which led to a demand for general education based on three major areas of study—humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences.

The position of leadership of the United States in international affairs has resulted in the introduction of new areas of instruction in colleges and universities. Courses in international

affairs have been introduced; courses in hitherto neglected areas, such as Soviet Russia and the Orient, have been multiplied; not only have new foreign languages been added but a new emphasis has been introduced with more attention given to the social, economic, and political backgrounds than has been the case in the past. Following the new interest in regional or area studies, courses have been organized in American culture or American civilization. The spectacular contributions and advances in science during the war stirred the imagination of the American public and students to such a degree as to lead to some alarm lest this area of study be emphasized at the expense of other areas. The proposed creation of a National Science Foundation with federal support included in its plans the provision of subsidies for students who show talent in the sciences.

Another effect of the international position of the United States has been the official recognition of the importance of international cultural relations as a concern of the government. It is recognized, however, that in this movement voluntary organizations, which have in the past played an important role in promoting international cultural relations, must not be superseded by a government agency, but must be encouraged to continue their activities. The interest of foreign educators and students in American education increased rapidly in the years between the two wars. That this interest will continue is manifested by the large number of foreign students who have come to study in this country on grants from their own government or from American foundations and institutions of higher education, or at their own expense. The use of lend-lease funds for educational purposes under the Fulbright Act will increase the flow of students to and from the United States. Finally, in the field of international cultural relations American educators and laymen played a leading role in promoting the establishment of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) with which close relations will be maintained through the National Commission for UNESCO.

World War I was followed by the beginning of a rapid increase in the enrollment of students in high schools. A similar increase has followed World War II at the college and university level as a result of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act (Public

Law 346) or the G.I. Bill of Rights. It is expected that the enrollments in institutions of higher education will in all probability become stabilized at three million students, about double the prewar enrollment. The G. I. Bill of Rights indicated that large numbers of young men and women have been enabled to attend colleges and universities, who, because of lack of means, would have been unable to do so. Here again the war has shown that equality of educational opportunity can only be realized, if the inequalities resulting from accident of residence and family circumstances are overcome by the extensive provision of grants from public funds.

INDEX

A

Acceleration, in college, 139, 148 f,
in high school, 88 ff.
Accreditation, for military experience,
245 ff.
Adams, Charles Francis, 179.
Adler, Mortimer, 201
Aides, nursery school, 46
American Association for an Inter-
national Office of Education, 269
American Association for Health,
Physical Education, and Recreation,
51
American Association of Junior Col-
leges, 134
American Association of Teachers
Colleges, 134
American Association of University
Professors, 134
American Association of University
Women, 46, 51
American College Publicity Associa-
tion, 124
American Council of Learned Socie-
ties, 172, 200, 234
American Council on Education, 12,
70, 78, 103, 126 ff., 143, 153, 157, 172,
249, 251, 262, 269, 274
*American Education and the War in
Europe*, 14 f.
American Historical Association, 98
American Home Economics Associa-
tion, 51
American Medical Association, 149
American Youth Commission, 78, 103
Arabic and Islamic Studies, 232
Area studies, 185, 236, 239
Armed forces, education and the,
240 ff.
Army Institute, 240
Army Separation Counseling Service,
245
Army Specialized Training Program
(ASTP), 151 ff., 236
Army Specialized Training Reserve
Program (ASTRP), 156
Army Talks, 259
Army university centers, 255 ff.
Arndt, C. O., 95
Association for Childhood Education,
46

Association of American Colleges, 134,
150, 157; committee on liberal edu-
cation, 207 ff.
Association of Land-Grant Colleges
and Universities, 134
Association of Medical Colleges, 149
Association of Urban Universities, 134
Attendance, school, and war, 53

B

Back-to-School Drives, 6, 21, 35, 86
Baltimore Conference on Higher Edu-
cation and the War, first, 136 ff.;
recommendations of, 138 ff.; second,
141 ff.
Barden Bill, 163 f
Barden, Graham A., 158
Barnard, F. A. P., 176
Barr, Stringfellow, 201
Baxter, James P., III, 207
Biarritz, university center at, 255 f.
Bloch, Bernard, 235
Bloom Bill, 264
Bloomfield, Leonard, 233, 235
Booker Washington Agricultural and
Industrial Institute, Liberia, 262
Boas, Franz, 233
Boom towns, 67; *see* Defense areas,
education in
Boxer Indemnity, 260
Bredvold, Louis I., 81
Briggs, Dean, 178
Briggs, Thomas H., 101, 106
Brigham, Carl, 178
Brown, Francis J., 129, 130, 159, 164,
245, 251
Buchanan, Scott, 201, 206
Buffalo, University of, and new cur-
riculum, 230
Burns, C. Delisle, 185 f.
Burruss, W. A., 134
Bush, Vannevar, 144

C

California, University of, 233
Canada, schools and war in, 94
Canby, Henry Seidel, 184
Carmichael, Leonard, 145
Carnegie Corporation of New York,
254

Carnegie Foundation, 180, 181, 254
 Central European Planning Board, 269
 Channing, William Ellery, 198
 "Charter of Education for Rural Children, A," 71
 Chase, H. W., 124
 Chicago, University of, 249
 Child Care Centers, 47 f.
 Child Health and Protection, White House Conference on, 44
 Child Labor, 52 ff., 85
 Children, care of, 4, 23, 45 f.
 Children in a Democracy, White House Conference on, 58, 75
 Children's Bureau, 53, 57, 85, 86, 87
 China, study of, 95
 Chinese Institute, 232
 Chinese students, aid to, 262
 Civil Affairs Training Schools (CATS), 236
 Civil Readjustment Program, 257 f.
 College and university finance, 161
College Program in Action, A Review of Working Principles at Columbia College, 229 f.
 College, the American, 177
 Colleges, liberal education in, 6, 172 ff.
 College teachers, 193 ff., 213, 227
 Columbia College program, 229 f.
 Command schools, 254
 Commission to study the Organization of Peace, 269
 Committee on Accrediting Procedures, 249
 Community service, 36
 Compton, Karl T., 144
 Conant, James B., 109, 144, 220
 Conference of Allied Ministers of Education, 269
 Conference of Government Representatives and College and University Administration, 133
 Congress on Education and Democracy, 10, 13
 Control, fear of federal, 8; President Truman on, 73
 Cornell University, 232
 Correspondence courses, USAFI, 257
 Council on Medical Education and Hospitals, 149
 Cowan, J. M., 234, 235
 Cowley, W. H., 157, 207
 Credits for military service, 245 ff.
 Cultural heritage, 225
 Cultures, international, 8
 Cultural Relations, Division of, 8, 261 f.

Cultural relations, international, 260 ff.
 Curriculum programs, war, 35 f.
 Curriculum, reform of college, 200 ff.

D

Data for State-wide Planning of Veterans' Education, 247
 Day, Edmund E., 155
 Defense, education for, 3
 Defense areas, education in, 46, 67
 Deferment, student, 125, 140, 162
 Deficiencies, educational, 41 ff.
 Delinquency, juvenile, 4, 52, 55 ff.
 Denver, University of, 200
 De Tocqueville, 175
 Dewey, John, 189, 205
 Dighton, William, 173
 Discipline, 5
 Division of Cultural Cooperation, 262
 Division of Cultural Relations, 8, 261 f.
 Division of International Educational Relations, U. S. Office of Education, 266
 Division of Science, Education, and Art, 262
 Doyle, Henry Grattan, 173
 Dumbarton Oaks, 96, 270

E

East and West Association, 95
 Education, for defence, 4; and federal aid, 7, 66 ff.; for victory, 23; deficiencies of, 41 ff.; agricultural, 85 f.; and the armed forces, 240 ff.; of veterans, 240 ff.; post-hostilities program of, 254 ff.
Education—An Investment in People, 72
 Education and Democracy, Congress on, 10, 13
Education and the Defense of American Democracy, 16 f.
Education and the Morale of a Free People, 17
Education and the United Nations, 269
 Education Branch, Special Supply Division, 236
Education for All American Youth, 22, 78, 109 ff.
 Education Wartime Commission. *See* Wartime Commission

Educational Policies Commission, 12, 70, 78, 89, 109, 150, 274, publications of, 14 ff., 269 f.
Educational Opportunities for Veterans, 245
Effect of Certain War Activities upon Colleges and Universities, 158
 Elective system, dissatisfaction with, 173
 Eliot, T. S., 193, 197
 Elliott, Edward C., 133
 Emergency certificates, 62, 63
 Emerson, 174
 Engineering, Science, and Management Defense Training (ESMDT), 146 ff.
 Engineering, Science, and Management War Training (ESMWT), 80, 148
 Enlisted Reserve Corps, 127
 Enrollment, estimated veteran, 245 ff.
 Enrollments, college and university, during war, 160; of women, 165
 Equality of opportunity, 7, 222
 Eton, 3
 Experimental Program, Yale College, 217
 Extracurricular activities, war, 36
 Extended school services, 48

F

Fair Labor Standards Act, 53, 54, 85
 Far East, study of, 95, 97
 Farrell, Father, 207
 Federal aid for education, 7, 66 ff.
Federal Aid for Education: A Review of Pertinent Facts, 70
 Federal funds for education, 67 ff.
 Federal Security Agency, 126
 Federal Works Agency, 49
 Federation of State Medical Boards, 149
 Finance, college and university, 161
 Fish, Carl Russell, 198
 Florence, university center in, 255
 Foerster, Norman, 192
 "Food for Freedom," 28
 Ford, Guy Stanton, 132
 Foreign Area and Language Study Curriculum (FALSC), 236
 Fosdick, Raymond, 190 f.
 Franklin, Benjamin, 174
 Fries, Charles C., 173
 Fulbright Bill, 265
 Fulbright, J. William, 270

G

General Education in a Free Society, 118 ff., 220 ff.
 General education, 182, 187, 224, 229 f.
 General Federation of Women's Clubs, 51
 George Dean Act, 78, 84
 George Washington University, 239
 Gideonse, Harry D., 207
 G. I. Bill of Rights, 243 f.
 Givens, Willard E., 22, 129
 Glass, Meta, 166
 Good Neighbor Policy, 8
 Go-to-School-Drives, 6, 21, 35, 86
 Graduate education, effects of, 196
 Graduate Record Examination, 181
 Graves, Mortimer, 232, 234, 235, 236
 Great Britain, schools and war in, 94
 Greene, T. M., 173, 177, 198, 207
 Guidance, 178; services, 36 f.
Guide to Colleges, Universities, and Professional Schools in the United States, A, 244 f.
Guide to the Evaluation of Educational Experience in the Armed Forces, 251

H

Haas, Mary R., 233
 Harvard University, 10, 232, 239; report on *General Education in a Free Society*, 118 ff., 220 ff.
 Health services, 36
 Hendel, Charles W., 207
 Hershey, Lewis B., 61, 131
 High schools, and the war, 77 f., and military training, 79; curricula, 93
 High school students, exodus of, 85 f.
 High School Victory Corps, 58, 81, 90 ff.
 Higher Education, 123 ff.; Selective Service and, 125 f.
Higher Education and National Defense, 130
Higher Education Cooperates in National Defense, 134
Higher Education and the War, 137
 History, *New York Times* test in, 97
 Hollis, E. V., 247
 House of Representatives. Committee on Education, 158
 Humanities in education, 10, 172 f., 190, 200, 229
 Hutchins, Robert, 201

I

- Illiteracy, 5, 7, 40, 41 f.
 India, study of, 95
 Information and Education Division of the Army, 254
 Institute on Educational Reconstruction, 269
 Intensive Language Program, 233 ff.
 Inter-American Education Foundation, Inc., 263, 267
 Inter-American Schools Service, 262
 Integration, 182
 International Commission for Educational Reconstruction, 268 f.
 International Cultural relations, 260 ff
 International Education Assembly, 269
 International understanding, education for, 96
 Iowa, State University of, College of Liberal Arts, curriculum, 213 ff.

J

- Jacobs, Randall, 81
 Japanese Institute, 232
 Japan, study of, 95
 Jacksonian and Jeffersonian principles, 222
 Jessen, Carl A., 79
 Jessup, Walter A., 182, 193
 Jewitt, Frank B., 144
 Joint Army and Navy Board for Training Unit Contracts, 154
 Joint Army and Navy Committee on Recreation and Welfare, 129, 236, 240
 Jones, Howard Mumford, 173
 Jones, Jesse H., 90
 Juvenile Courts, 55
 Juvenile delinquency, 4, 52, 55 ff

K

- Kindergartens, 46
 Knox, Frank, 90

L

- Labor, child, 52 ff., 85
 Languages, study of, 9; intensive methods of teaching, 9, 231 ff.; unusual, 232, 235
 Lanham Act, 49, 69
 Latin America, courses on, 9, 95 f., 97
 Lawler, Eugene S., 71

- Leadership, in American democracy, 12 ff.
 Lenroot, Katharine, 54, 59
 Liaison Committee for International Education, 269
 Liberal education, 6, 118 ff., 172, 189 f, 220 ff; and the teacher, 186, 193 f, and values, 188
Liberal Education Re-Examined: Its Role in a Democracy, 173
 Linguistic Society, 172
 Loans, student, 128

M

- Manual of Advisement and Guidance*, 245
 Mathematics, deficiencies in, 81 f.
 McCormick, Representative, 158
 McNutt, Paul V., 22, 24, 38, 78, 90, 274
 Maritain, Jacques, 200, 204
 Meiklejohn, Alexander J., 205
 Millikan, Robert A., 191
 Millett, Fred B., 196
 Mental deficiencies, 41 ff
 Military training in high schools, 79
 Military service, credit for, 140
 Minnesota, University of, 239
 Mississippi Historical Association, 98
 Morale, definition of, 17
 Morale Service Division, 240
 Morison, S. E., 179
 Mothers, working, 4, 23
 Mundt, Karl E., 270

N

- Nash, Arnold S., 206
 National Academy of Sciences, 143
 National Association for Nursery Education, 46, 51
 National Association of Secondary School Principals, 90, 117
 National Association of State Universities, 134
 National Catholic Education Association, 134
 National Commission for Young Children, 45, 46
 National Commission for UNESCO, 272, 277
 National Committee on Education and Defense, 129 ff, conference of, 130 ff.

National Committee on Professional Man Power, 145
 National Congress of Parents, 51
 National Council for Social Studies, 83, 98, 99
 National Council of Chief State School Officers, 51, 52, 69
 National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, 82
 National Defense Research Council, 143
 National Education Association, 11, 12, 51, 58, 96. *See* Educational Policies Commission
 National Research Council, 143, 172
 National Resources Planning Board, 74, 126
 National Roster of Scientific and Specialized Personnel, 126, 145
 National School of Modern Oriental Languages, 232, 234
 National Science Foundation, 277
 National Survey of Secondary Education, 78
 National Youth Administration, 128
 Natural Sciences, in college curriculum, 228
 Navy Civilian Readjustment Program, 245
 Navy College Training Program (NCTP), 153 ff., 236
 Navy Language Schools, 232
 Near East College Association, aid to, 262
 Negro children, educational expenditure for, 79
 Neilson, William A., 205
New York Times, history test of, 97
 Nimitz, Chester W., 81
 Norton, John K., 71
 Nursery schools. *See* Children, care of

O

Oberlin College, 201
 Office of Community War Services, youth centers of, 60
 Office of Defense, Health, and Welfare Services, 48
 Office of Inter-American Affairs, 263, 267
 Office of International Information and Cultural Affairs, 262, 264
 Office of Scientific Research, 144
 Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, 263

Office of War Information, 87
Organizing Higher Education for National Defense, 144
 Ortega Y Gasset, José, 192
 Osborn, Frederick H., 240, 249
Our Children, 42, 74
Outline Guide to the Practical Study of Foreign Languages, *An*, 235
Outline of Linguistic Analysis, 235

P

Pennsylvania, University of, 239
 Perry, Ralph Barton, 198
 Philological Association, 172
 Ph D. degree, 183, 193, 196, 227
 Physical deficiencies, 5, 40, 42 ff.
 Physical Fitness, Joint Committee on, 44, 45
Planning for American Youth, 117
 Pre-induction courses, 80 ff.
 President's Committee on Higher Education, 164 f.
 Preschool child *See* Children, care of
 Princeton University, revised plan of study, 218 ff.
 Progressive Education Association, 46
 Public Law 16, 243
 Public Law 346, 243

R

Randall, John Herman, Jr., 193
 Regional Studies, 185, 236, 239
 Rejections under Selective Service System, 43
 Religion, in college curriculum, 224
 Religious instruction, 9
 Research and teaching, 185
 Rickenbacker, Eddie, 92
 Rockefeller Foundation, 234
 Rogers, Francis Millet, 232
 Roosevelt, Franklin Delano, 8, 10, 13, 19, 48, 66, 75, 123, 124, 128, 143
 Roosevelt, Mrs. Franklin Delano, 76
 Rowntree, Leonard G., 42 f.
 Rural education, White House Conference on, 71 f.
 Russell, William F., 13

S

Salaries, teachers, 65
 San Francisco Conference, 96, 270
 Sapir, Edward, 233
 School and College Civilian Morale Service, 23

School of Modern Oriental Languages and Civilization, 232
 Schools, war services of, 29 ff., 35
 Scholars of the House Program, Yale College, 217
 Schurman, Jacob Gould, 179
 Science and technology, place of, 10
 Sciences, and values, 190
 Seaton, Roy A., 146
 Secondary education, for all, 77 ff.; unrest in, 77 f., 101 ff.
 Sedan, battle of, 3
 Servicemen's Readjustment Act, 243 ff.
 Shrivenham, university center at, 255 ff.
 Sills, Kenneth C. M., 206
 Smith-Hughes Act, 78, 84
 Social Sciences in college curriculum, 229
 Social Science Research Council, 172
Social Studies Look Beyond the War, The, 99
Social Studies Mobilize for Victory, The, 99
Sound Educational Credit for Military Experience: A Recommended Program, 251
 Spaulding, Francis T., 240
 Specialization, 183 f.; 227
 Special Service, Division of, War Department, 240, 254
 St. John's College, Annapolis, 201
 Standard Plan, Yale College, 216 f.
 Stanford University, 200
Statement of Principles Relating to the Educational Problems of Returning Soldiers, Sailors, and Displaced War Industry Workers, 242
 Stimson, Henry L., 90
 Studebaker, John W., 22, 23, 24, 38, 61, 78, 96, 137
Student and His Knowledge, The, 180 f.
 Students, deferment of, 125, 140, 162
Support of Education in Wartime, The, 19
Survey of Language Classes in the Army Specialized Training Program, 237 f.

T

Taft, Robert A., 270
 Tappan, Henry P., 175 f., 180
 Teachers, shortage of, 4, 7, 19, 35, 61 ff.; service of, 19 f.; supply of,

23, 29; exodus of, 35, 61 ff.; recruitment of, 62 f.; salaries of, 65, liberal education and, 186, 193 f.
 Teachers, college, 193 ff., 213, 227
 Teachers College, Columbia University, 10, 242
 Teachers Supply and Demand, Committee on, 62
 Teaching and research, 185
 Technical schools, 254
 Technology and science, place of, 10
 Teen-agers, 60
 Tests, for military personnel, 249
 Tildsley, John L., 101
 Tolman, Richard C., 144
 Trager, George L., 235
 Truman, President, 51, 73, 164
 Tyler, Ralph W., 249

U

Unfinished Business in American Education, 71
 United Nations Economic and Social Council, 271
 United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), 268, 271 f.
 United States Armed Forces Institute (USAFI), 236, 240 ff., 249, 257
 United States Chamber of Commerce, Committee on Education, 72
 United States Office of Education, 12, 48, 50, 59, 78, 82, 84, 86, 95, 97, 146, 266; services of, 32 ff.
 Unit schools, 254
 Universities Committee on Postwar International Problems, 269
 Universities, liberal education in, 6, 172 ff.

V

Values, search for, 188 ff.; spiritual, 9
 Vanderbilt, University of, 200
 Van Doren, Mark, 201, 202 f.
 Veterans, education of, 240 ff.
 Veterans Administration, 244 ff.
 Victory Corps, High School, 90 ff.
 Vocational education, 28, 78, 84 f.
 Vocational Rehabilitation Act, 243 ff.

W

Wage and Hour Law, 52, 54, 85
 Walters, Raymond, 133

- War Department, Division of Special Service, 240, 254
 War Manpower Commission, 87, 157
War Policy for American Schools, A, 18
 Wartime Commission, Education, 22 ff., 45, 48, 62, 79, 157
 Wartime Commissions, State, 31 f.
 Warton, technological institute at, 255
 Waterloo, battle of, 3
 Wayland, Francis, 175
 Wegener, A. Pelzer, 173
 Wesley, Edgar B., 98
What the Schools Should Teach in Wartime, 20 f.
What the High Schools Ought to Teach, 78, 103 ff.
 Whithead, A. N., 199, 205
 White House Conference, on Child Health and Protection, 44; on Children in a Democracy, 58, 75, on Rural Education, 71
 Women, higher education of, and the war, 165 ff.; enrollments in colleges for, 165; acceleration in, 168
 Work-study programs, 86
 Wriston, Henry M., 173, 199
- Y**
- Yale College, new program in liberal arts, 215 ff.
- Z**
- Zook, George F., 22, 95, 129, 134, 164

DR. KANDEL'S DISCUSSION OF PRESENT-day education examines the deficiencies disclosed by the new demands made upon educational institutions during the Second World War. Careful attention is given to the crisis resulting from the exodus of teachers from schools for war service or war industries, to the movement for federal aid and its need; to the shortages discovered in areas of study which public schools professed to teach, and to the threatened disappearance in higher education of traditional studies not necessary for winning the war.

As teachers continued to leave the profession to enter war industries, the nation began to realize the inadequacies of the salaries paid them, but postwar developments have proved that the American public has not yet recognized the key position of the teacher in giving reality to the ideal of equality of educational opportunity for all—an ideal still far from achievement.

Dr. Kandel points out the great defect of higher education—the lack of a sense of direction—and discusses the compromise between the urgency of present training needs and the future need for professionally trained men and women.

■

In a critical analysis of liberal education the author shows the way in which Yale, Princeton, and Harvard, among others, have defined liberal education and the manner in which they are attempting to make it effective.

An account of nonmilitary education as it was handled by the army and navy is followed by a discussion of the plans for veteran education, the G.I. Bill, and a post-hostilities program put into operation by the armed forces. This program, including a wide range of educational facilities, culminated in the four Army University Centers abroad.

Prepared under the auspices of the Committee on War Studies of the American Council of Learned Societies, this book presents the first account of the impact of the war on all aspects of education. It reveals, in admirable synthesis, the miracle of adaptation which American education made to war needs, the increasing awareness of educational shortcomings, and the thinking of America's intellectual leaders on one of the nation's greatest problems. Of especial and timely significance, it gives material for a blueprint for the future on the basis of the evidence that the war years proved education to be a concern of the whole nation.

■

DR. ISAAC LEON KANDEL IS WELL KNOWN AS EDUCATOR, editor, and author. A graduate of the University of Manchester, England, from which he received his M.A. degree, he holds a Ph.D. degree from Columbia University, a Litt.D. degree from the University of Melbourne, and an LL.D. degree from the University of North Carolina. In 1937 he was decorated Chevalier, Legion d'Honneur.

At present Professor Emeritus, Teachers College, Columbia University, he has lectured at the University of Pennsylvania and taught as Visiting Professor at the University of California, Johns Hopkins University, College of the City of New York, and Yale University. He served as editor of *School and Society*; *Universities Quarterly*; and *Educational Yearbook*, International Institute, Teachers College, Columbia University.

In 1946 he was a member of the U. S. Education Mission to Japan. He was also a consultant to UNESCO. During the war years he served on Committees of the American Council on Education, the American Council of Learned Societies, and the Commission to Study the Organization of Peace. For the last ten years of its existence he was a member and then treasurer of the U. S. National Committee on Intellectual Cooperation. In 1947-48 he has been a Science Research Fellow at the University of Manchester and, in 1948, Professor of American Studies at the same institution.

Among Dr. Kandel's many books are: *History of Secondary Education*; *Comparative Education*; *Types of Administration*; *The Cult of Uncertainty*; *Intellectual Co-operation, National and International*; *United States Activities in International Cultural Relations*.